ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

Cunningham v.1
1867425
urch history of Scotland

STORAGE

DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS FROM POCKET

PUBLIC LIBRARY
FORT WAYNE AND ALLEN COUNTY, IND.

M.

STO

ACPL ITEM
DISCARDED

3 1833 0

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-EMD-195_1

THE

CHURCH HISTORY

OF

SCOTLAND

FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN
ERA TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY

JOHN CUNNINGHAM, D.D.

AUTHOR OF "THE QUAKERS: AN INTERNATIONAL HISTORY," "A NEW THEORY
OF KNOWING AND KNOWN," ETC., ETC.

V.1

SECOND EDITION

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

EDINBURGH: JAMES THIN
1882

1867425

CHURCH HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

THE First Edition has now been exhausted for several years. In this Second Edition I have carefully gone over the whole narrative, and by the light of recent research have been able to alter and amend many things. I have, moreover, continued the narrative with a fulness proportioned to the rest of the history down to 1843—the date of the Free Church Secession. Beyond that date, and down to the present day, I have given merely an outline of ecclesiastical events, carefully avoiding living divines, as happily not yet historical personages.

J. C.

MANSE OF CRIEFF, *9th May* 1882.

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION.

Our best Scottish Ecclesiastical Histories are confined to particular periods. Indeed, so far as I know, there is not one which will conduct the student from the epoch of Christianity to the day in which he lives. This is the task I have undertaken; but in traversing this long tract of time I have naturally lingered longest on those periods which are either most interesting or most instructive.

Our ecclesiastical writers in general appear to have thought that the Church in our country before the Reformation was only the Church of Rome, and not the Church of Scotland too; and accordingly they have left its history without investigation and without record. As well might our political writers have passed over the history of the kingdom prior to the Revolution. In the one case our ancestors were living under a bad despotism, and in the other under a debasing superstition, but still they were our ancestors. Though the Church before the Reformation was Roman in its architecture, still it was built upon Scottish ground, and they were Scottish men and women who worshipped in it. It is impossible to understand our Church History subsequent to the Reformation without knowing something of our Church History prior to it. It is impossible to appreciate our present institutions, our present habits of thought, our present likings and dislikings, without reverting to our past Papistry. The Reformation in Scotland was certainly very complete — in no other country in the world was it so complete; but still

it could not root out every old idea, nor carry away every ancient landmark, nor make us an entirely different people from what we were before. The key to many things in our character and history is to be sought for in ante-Reformation times.

Though Scotland presents but a narrow field, yet the ecclesiastical element has there had a fuller and freer development than in any other country. What Egypt is to the man who would ransack ancient temples and tombs, Scotland is to the man who would study the manifestations of ecclesiastical life. The Church of England never has had much action as a Church, and accordingly it can scarcely be said to have any history, except in so far as its history is bound up in the biographies of the illustrious men who have been reared within its pale. It has had no General Assembly to concentrate the energy of every individual, and to utter the sentiments of the whole. The Church of Scotland, on the other hand, from its republican constitution and representative courts, has a well-marked and peculiarly instructive history of its own, distinct from the biographies of its individual ministers, distinct from the political history of the State. But besides this, peculiar circumstances in the history of the country gave to the ecclesiastical element peculiar vigour. The weakness of the monarchy till the Union of the Crowns, allowed the free expansion of ideas which have never been tolerated in countries where the monarchy is strong; and during the civil wars, when the throne was laid low, they attained to a fuller expansion still. For a season the Church was left to wield its own powers, and to work out what it conceived to be its own ends, free from all pressure from without. Accordingly, during that period, ecclesiasticism is to be found in its purest form. In truth, the Church of Scotland has had within Scotland a history similar to what the Church of Rome has had within Christendom. We see the same laws in operation, though on a smaller scale, and under modifying circumstances. In the career of the one we can discern the blessings which flow from a pure creed and simple worship, and in that of the other the blighting effects

of a baneful superstition; but with both there has been the same union and energy of action, the same assumption of spiritual supremacy, the same defiance of law courts, parliaments, and kings. The history of either can be traced with equal precision, sometimes blending with civil history, but at other times diverging widely from it. I know only three Churches whose histories stand thus prominently out—the Jewish, the Roman, and the Scottish. Geneva had such a Church too, but it was only for a very little season.

In writing this History I have endeavoured above all things to purge my heart of all leaven of polemical and party hatred, and to follow faithfully both truth and charity. I have not concealed my own sentiments, for it had been either hypocrisy or cowardice to have done so; but I have endeavoured to state them without asperity, and to do justice to the motives, the opinions, and the conduct of those who differ from me. Though I cannot hope that I have arrived at perfect impartiality, I trust I have never sacrificed truth to subserve a party purpose. I have seen enough and read enough to know that worth and wisdom are not confined to any Church or any sect, and that infallibility does not belong to Presbytery any more than to Popery.

J. C.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I.

CHAPTER I.

Druidism prevalent in Britain at Christian Era, 1. Druid a Celtic word, 1. Druidical Deities, 2. The Druids offered Human Sacrifices, and had some notions of a Future State, 2. The Ethics and Festivals of Druidism, 3. Druidical Circles, 5. The Divisions, Functions, and Science of the Druids, 6. Destruction of the Druids, 7. The Scots and Picts, 8. Scandinavians and Teutons, 9. Scandinavian Mythology, 11. The Norseman's Heaven, 13. Vestiges of Druidism and Scandinavianism, 15.

CHAPTER II.

Early Chroniclers, 17. King Donald, 19. Kirk Madrine, 19. Legend of St Andrew and St Rule, 20. Rise of the Pelagian Controversy, 21. Writings of St Augustine and St Jerome, 21. The First Evangelist of Britain unknown, 22. Constant Intercourse between Rome and Britain, 23. Missionary Spirit of the First Christians, 24. Christianity probably reached Scotland from the South, 25. State of Scotland at this time, 26. Barbarism of both Picts and Scots, 27. Difficulties in the way of Christianity, 27.

CHAPTER III.

St Ninian, 27. His Labours among the Galwegians and Southern Picts, 28. Foundation of *Candida Casa*, the First Stone Building in the Country, 28. Palladius, 29. St Patrick, 30. St Columba and his Biographers, 31. Parentage and Education of St Columba, 32. His Arrival in Iona, 32. Labours among the Picts, 33. Reasons for selecting Iona as the Seat of his Monastery, 34. Monastery of Iona: its Recluses, Rules, &c., 35. Death and Character of Columba, 36, 37. Troubles of the Monks of Iona from the Incursions of the Norsemen, 37. St Mungo the Contemporary of St Columba, 38. Visit of Columba to Kentigern at the Molendinar Burn, 39. St Cuthbert, 39. Outline of General Church History for the First Six Centuries, 40, 41. Rise of Diocesan Episcopacy, 42, 43. Rise of Monachism, 44, 45. Britain lost to the Roman World after the withdrawal of the Roman Legions, 46. Scottish Monachism, 47. The Scottish Bishops subject to the Presbyter-Abbot of Iona, 48.

CHAPTER IV.

Arrival of the Monk Augustine in Kent, 49. He converts Ethelbert, King of Kent, and establishes himself at Canterbury, 50. Mission of Aidan to Northumbria, 51. He settles on Lindisfarne, and begins his apostolic work, 52. He dies, and is succeeded by Finan, 53. Northumberland, Mercia, and Essex Christianised by Monks from Iona, 53. Disputes in regard to Scotch Presbyters consecrating Bishops, 54, 55. Controversies about Easter, 56. Council of Whitby, 57. Disputes about the Tonsure, 58. Retirement of the Culdees from Northumbria, 59. Opinions of the Celtic Monks, 60, 61. Quarrels of the British and Romish Clergy, 62. The Culdees, 63. Culdeé Remains, 65. Queen Margaret: her Piety and Beneficence, 67. Her Disputations with the Culdees, 68. Her Death, 69. Degeneracy of the Culdees, 69.

CHAPTER V.

Wars of the Scots and Picts, 70. Termination of the Pictish Kingdom, 70. Origin of Tithes—Charlemagne—Alfred, 71, 72. Malcolm Canmore—Margaret—and English Settlers, 73. David I. erects many Bishoprics and Monasteries, and reforms the Church, 73, 74. The Barons follow his example, 74. Origin of Scotch Bishoprics, Parishes, and Abbeys, 74. Bishoprics of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Dunkeld, 74, 75. Division of the Country into Parishes, 75. Orders of Monks, 77. Passion to Endow Monasteries, 78. Appropriation of Parishes, 79. Spottiswood's "Religious Houses," 79, 80. Carthusians at Perth, 81. Hospitallers and Templars, 81, 82. Nunneries and Nuns, 83. Wealth of the Roman Hierarchy, 83, 84. The Clergy promote Agriculture, 84, 85. They preserve Literature and conduct Business, 86. The Chronicles, Registers, and Chartularies of the Religious Houses, 87. The Monasteries Educational Institutions, 88. The Monasteries served as Inns and Poorhouses, 89. Nature of the connection between the Church and the State, 89. Ancient Scottish Liturgies, 90, 91. Breviary of Aberdeen, 91. Organs, Choirs, and Music, 92, 93. Religious Houses: their Architects, Builders, &c., 94-96.

CHAPTER VI.

Religion and Politics closely intertwined, 96. The Archbishop of York claims the Primacy of Scotland, and the Archbishop of Canterbury disputes it, 97. Turgot consecrated, and dies, 97, 98. Eadmer made Archbishop of St Andrews, but resigns it on account of Disputes about his Consecration, 99. Thurstin claims Obedience of Glasgow, 99. Consecrates Robert to See of St Andrews, 100. Bishops of the Orkneys, 100. David's Church-Reform, 101. David's Character and Death, 101. Malcolm IV. and William the Lion, 102. Council at Northampton, 103. Speech of Gilbert Murray, 103. Disputes about the Bishopric of St Andrews, 104. The Pope excommunicates William, 105. Pope Lucius sends William the Golden Rose, 105. Clement declares Scotland dependent only on Rome, 106. Church of Scotland copies Anglican Models, 107.

The Crusades, 108. Rights of Sanctuary, 109. Slavery, 110. Scotland placed under an Interdict, 111. Bishop of Caithness roasted alive, 112. The Scotch Clergy obtain Permission to hold Provincial Councils, 113. A Roman Legate visits Scotland, and is withstood by the King, 114. Cardinal Ottobon De Fieschi attempts to raise a Procuration, 115. The Twentieth of Benefices granted for the Holy War, 115. Benemundus de Vicci visits Scotland, 116. The Invasion of the Norwegians, 116. Arrival of the Mendicants, 117. Eminent Scotch Writers, 117. Michael Scot, 117. John Holybush, Richard of St Victore, and Adam Scot, 118. Thomas Learmont, 119. Duns Scotus, 119. Death of Alexander III., 120. Competition for the Crown, 121. The part taken by the Clergy in the War of Independence, 123. The Pope publishes a Truce between Scotland and England, and excommunicates Bruce, 124. The Estates of Scotland publish a Manifesto, setting forth the Independence of the Kingdom, and Bruce's Right to the Throne, 125. Death of Bruce, and Adventure of his Heart, 126. Reigns of David II., Robert II., and Robert III., 127. John De Fordun, Barbour, Bassol, Blair, Dempster, and Varoye, 128.

CHAPTER VII.

Slow Growth of the Papacy, 129. Schism in the Church, 131. Council of Constance, and Rise of Wickliff, 131, 132. Martyrdom of Resby, 133. Foundation of the University of St Andrews, 133. James I.: his Vigour, and Reforms, 134-136. Martyrdom of Craw, 136. Visit of Æneas Silvius, 137. Murder of James I., and Troubles during the Minority of James II., 138. Foundation of the University of Glasgow, 139. Character and Services of Bishop Kennedy, 142. Patrick Grahame succeeds Kennedy at St Andrews, and gets the See erected into an Archbishopric, 144. Said to have been Mad, 145. Simoniacal Practices, 146. James III. is assassinated, and is succeeded by James IV., 147. Foundation of the University of Aberdeen, 147. Hector Boethius its first Principal: his Character, 149. First Native Literature, 150. Literary Attainments of the Clergy, and Anecdote of Bishop Forman, 151. Glasgow erected into an Archbishopric, 153. Archbishop Blackadder persecutes the Lollards, 153. Introduction of Printing, and its Influence on the Reformation, 154. Death of James IV. at Flodden, and his Character, 155.

CHAPTER VIII.

Leo X. ascends the Papal Throne: his Character, 156. Sale of Indulgences, and the German Reformation, 157, 158. Contest for the See of St Andrews, 159. "Cleansing the Causeway," 161. Administration and Character of the Duke of Albany, and Queen Margaret, 161. Gawin Douglas, 162. Patrick Hamilton: his Opinions and Martyrdom, 162-165. Institution of the College of Justice, 165. Visit of Antonio Campeggio, as Papal Legate, to James V., 166. Diffusion of the Lutheran Opinions, 166. Alexander Seaton, 167. Martyrdom of Forest, Gourlay, and Straiton, 167. Laws against Heresy and the Importation of Lutheran Books, 168. Henry VIII. of England revolts against Rome, 168. Dr Barlow sent on a Mission to Scotland, 169. James V. Marries, first

Magdalene of France, and afterwards Mary of Guise, 170. Martyrdom of Forret, Simpson, Keillor, Beveridge, and Forrester, 171. The Vicar of Dollar and the Bishop of Dunkeld, 171. Martyrdom of Russel and Kennedy, 172. David Beaton made Archbishop of St Andrews, 172. Sadler's Mission to Scotland, 173. Acts of Parliament against Heretics, 176. Acts of Parliament for the Reform of the Church and Churchmen, 177. The Embarrassment of James, 178. King James dies, 179. Cardinal Beaton claims the Regency, 180. The Nobles appoint the Earl of Arran Regent, 181. Henry VIII. projects a Marriage between Prince Edward and Queen Mary, 181. The Parliament authorizes the reading of the Scriptures in the Vulgar Tongue, 183. War between England and Scotland, 185. The French and English Factions, 186. Law against Heretics, and Martyrdoms at Perth, 186. George Wishart, 186. His Seizure, Trial, and Death, 189. Conspiracy to assassinate Beaton, 189. The Conspirators surprise his Castle and murder him, 190. Character of Beaton, 191. The Conspiracy Traced, 191-194.

CHAPTER IX.

The Romish Creed, 194. Religious Edifices in Papal Times, 196. Preaching, 197. Sunday: how spent, 198. Pilgrimages, 199. Religious Processions, 200. Mysteries, 200. Piety of Papal Times, 201. Ancient Oaths, and Act to prevent Swearing, 203. Morality of Papal Times, 203. Abuses in the Patronage of the Church, 204. Licentiousness of the Clergy, 207. Literary Attainments of the Clergy, 208. Revenues of the Clergy, 210. Influences leading to the Reformation, 211. Power of Poetry, 211. Sir David Lyndsay's Poems, 213. Profane Ballads transmuted into Spiritual Songs, 215. Proportion of the Nation attached to the Protestant Doctrines, 218.

CHAPTER X.

Hamilton made Archbishop of St Andrews, 219. Henry VIII. of England assists the Castilians, 220. Knox joins them, 220. He is called to be a Protestant Preacher, 222. Theories of Orders, 224. The Conspirators surrender the Castle to the French Admiral, 226. Knox and his Companions made Galley Slaves, 227. Somerset invades Scotland, and Battle of Pinkie fought, 228. Queen Mary is betrothed to the Dauphin, and sent to France, 228. Mary of Guise manages to supplant Arran in the Regency, 229. Provincial Council held, 230. Adam Wallace suffers Martyrdom, 231. Controversy about the Pater-noster, 231. Another Council held, 232. Catechism published, 233. Acts of Parliament levelled at the Reformers, 234. Edward VI. and Mary of England 235. Knox is liberated, and settles in England, 236. He retires to Geneva, and becomes acquainted with Calvin, 237. He returns to Scotland, 238. Knox preaches and administers the Sacrament in different parts of the country, 239. He is summoned to answer for his conduct, but the diet is abandoned, 240. He returns to Geneva, 240. The Reformers invite Knox to return, and then repent having done so, 242. The First Covenant, 243. Protestant Congregations formed, and Protestant Barons

assume name of Lords of the Congregation, 244. Resolutions of the Congregation, 245. Martyrdom of Walter Mill, 247. Demands of the Protestant Barons, 248. Policy of the Queen Regent, 250. Marriage of Mary with the Dauphin, 251. The last Roman Council, 252. The Regent summons the Preachers and outlaws them, 255. Knox preaches at Perth, and the Mob destroy the Monasteries, 256. The Regent marches upon Perth, but consents to a Treaty, 257. Knox preaches at Crail, Anstruther, and St Andrews, 258. The Abbey of Scone and the Abbey of Cambuskenneth are destroyed, 259. Traditionary Maxim of Knox, 260. Francis and Mary, now King and Queen of France, try to detach the Prior of St Andrews from the Protestant Cause, but fail, 262. Invectives of Knox and other Preachers, 263. Negotiations with England set on foot, 263. Knox's Proposals, 264. Views of the Leaders of the Congregation, 265. The Protestant Barons depose the Queen Regent, 267. Treaty of Berwick, 270. The English besiege Leith, 270. Death and Character of the Queen Regent, 271. Treaty of Edinburgh, 273. The Parliament meets, 273. The Protestant Confession is adopted, 275. Acts against Popery, 276.

CHAPTER XI.

Contrast between the Scotch and English Reformations, 277. The First Staff of the Protestant Church, 280. The First Book of Discipline, 281. The Office-Bearers of the New Church, 282. The Worship and Discipline of the New Church, 285. The Patrimony of the Old Church, and its appropriation by the New, 288. Influence of Church Property on the Reformation, 291. Knox denounces the Sacrilege of the Nobles, 292. The Privy Council refuse to sanction the First Book of Discipline, 292. First General Assembly, 293. Disputation between Romanists and Reformers, 294. Second Assembly, 294. Demolition of Religious Houses, 295. Embassages to France and death of Francis II., 296. Lesley and Lord James Stewart, 297. Mary returns to Scotland, 298. The Mass at Holyrood, 298. First Interview between Mary and Knox, 299. The Holy Water of the Court, 303. Disputes between the Protestant Barons and Clergy, 304. Scheme to pay the Protestant Ministers out of the Thirds of Benefices, 305. Dissipation of Ecclesiastical Property, 307. Business of the First Assemblies, 311. Divided and excited state of the Nation, 313. Policy of Queen Mary, 314. Second Interview of Knox and the Queen, 315. Third Interview of Knox and the Queen, 317. The Parliament passes an Act of Indemnity, 318. Knox's Sermon on the Queen's Marriage, 319. Scene at the Palace, 319. Knox summoned before the Council, charged with Treason, 321. Knox marries his second wife, 322. Darnley arrives in Scotland, and gains the heart of Mary, 323. Acts of the General Assembly, 324. Marriage of Mary and Darnley, 324. Knox's Sermon, 325. Moray and others rebel, 327. Murder of Rizzio, 328. Murder of Darnley, 329. Mary marries Bothwell, and Nobles rebel, 329. The General Assembly meets, 330. Moray made Regent, 332.

CHAPTER XII.

Moray passes Acts in favour of the Church, 333. Mary escapes from Lochleven, and Battle of Langside, 335. Murder of the Regent Moray, 336.

His Character, 336. The Factions of the King and Queen, 337. Knox at St Andrews, 338. Archbishop Hamilton hanged, 339. Church Property—How to be disposed of? 339. Concordat of Leith, 341. The Assembly sanctions it, 343. Motives of the Ministers, 344. Views of Knox, 345. Death and Character of Knox, 347. Execution of Kirkcaldy, and sudden death of Maitland, 349. Andrew Melville returns to Scotland, 350. Was Episcopacy Scriptural? 351. Decisions of the Assembly, 352. The Regent Morton threatens Melville, 353. James VI. nominally assumes the Government, 354. Influence of Melville and Beza, 354. Second Book of Discipline, 356. Erection of Presbyteries, 360. D'Aubigné obtains the King's Favour, and is created Duke of Lennox, 361. He abjures Popery, 362. Craig's Confession, 362. Execution of Morton, 363. Montgomery accepts Archbishopric of Glasgow, and is brought before the Church Courts, 364. Montgomery yields, to escape Excommunication, 365. Disputes revived, and Montgomery Excommunicated, 366. Melville braves the Earl of Arran, 366. Durie Banished, 368. The Power of the Keys, 368. The Raid of Ruthven, 370. George Buchanan, 371. French Embassage, 373. Durie and Melville before the Council, 374. The Black Acts of 1584, 375. Reluctant Submission of the Ministers to the Acts, 379. Return of Exiled Nobles and Ministers, and Flight of Arran, 380. Lord Maxwell celebrates Mass, 381. General Assembly of 1586, 382. The King orders Prayers to be offered for his Mother, 383. Act passed Annexing the Temporalities of Benefices to the Crown, 384. The Spanish Armada, 385. The Marriage of James VI., 385. The Assembly of 1590, and the Speech of the King, 387. Death of Archbishop Adamson, 388. Act of Parliament restoring Presbytery, 388.

CHAPTER XIII.

The General Assembly; its Constitution, and the Sources of its Strength, 389. The Superintendents discontinued, 393. Clerical Costumes prescribed by Act of Assembly, 393. Number of Churches without Ministers, 394. The Book of Common Prayer, 395. Domestic Devotions, 396. Fasts, 397. Discipline of the Church, 398. State of Society, 399. Witchcraft, 399. Sunday Observance, 401. Clerk-Plays, 401. The Robin Hood Plays, Queen of May, &c., 402. Pageants, 403. The Printing Press: its Supervision by the Church, 404. First Edition of the Bible published in Scotland, 405. Ill-usage of the Papists, 406. Jealousies of the Papists and Protestants, 408. James VI. combats both Presbyterians and Papists, 411. Liberties of the Ministers with the King, 412. Bancroft's Attack upon the Church of Scotland, 413. The Brownists: their Rise, Opinions, and Reception in Scotland, 414.

CHAPTER XIV.

Apprehension of Ker at the Cumbraes, 416. The Spanish Blanks found in his possession, 416. James marches against the Popish Earls who had subscribed the Blanks, 417. Resolutions of the General Assembly, 417. Meeting of the Parliament, and Excommunication of the Popish Lords by the Synod of Fife, 420. The King's Perplexities, 421. The Popish Lords

crave a Trial, 421. Demands of the Protestants, 421. Resolutions of the Committee of Parliament, 423. Dissatisfaction in the Country, 424. Bothwell's Treasons and Rebellions, 425. Battle of Glenlivet, 426. James marches to Strathbogie and Slaines, and compels Huntly and Errol to flee, 427. The King invited to Kiss a Crucifix, 427. The Popish Lords leave the Country, 428. The Octavians and the Cubiculars, 429. General Assembly of 1596, 429. Huntly and Errol return to Scotland in Disguise, 431. The King resolves to pardon them, 432. Violent Remonstrances of Andrew Melville, 432. Ross, Black, and others defame the King in the Pulpit, 434. Black is Summoned before the Council, and declines its Jurisdiction, 435. Black is found guilty, and put in ward, 436. Spiritual Independence, 437. Riot in Edinburgh, 438. The King resolves to reintroduce Episcopacy, and circulates Queries in regard to Church-Government, 440. Assembly at Perth; its Compliances, 441. Assembly at Dundee appoints a Commission, 443. Restoration of the Popish Lords, 444. The Parliament agrees to receive a number of Ministers, as representing the Third Estate, 444. Assembly at Dundee agrees to appoint Representatives to sit in Parliament, 446. The Ordination of Bruce, 447. Lawsuit between the King and Bruce, 448. James publishes the "Basilicon Doron," 448. The King's Disputes with the Clergy about a Company of Comedians, 451. Assembly at Montrose: its Resolutions in Regard to those who were to sit in Parliament, 452. The Gowrie Conspiracy. 453. Erection of the University of Edinburgh, 456. Assembly at Burntisland in 1601, 456. Accession of James VI. to the English Throne, 457.

CHAPTER XV.

Conference of English Divines at Hampton Court, 458. The King prorogues the Assembly indicted to meet at Aberdeen in July 1604, 461. He dissolves the Assembly indicted to meet at Aberdeen in July 1605; but some of the Ministers constitute the Meeting, fix upon a day for a future Assembly, and then adjourn, 462. They are called before the Council, and having declined its jurisdiction, are tried for treason, and found guilty, 463. The Parliament meets and restores the Episcopal Estate, 464. The King invites some of the Scotch Bishops and Presbyterian Ministers to Court, 466. He puts them through a course of Episcopal Divinity, 466-8. Andrew Melville writes an Epigram on the Anglican Worship, 468. He is tried by the English Council, found guilty, and sent to the Tower, 469. Future Career and Character of the two Melvilles, 470. Assembly held at Linlithgow, 471. Popular Dissatisfaction with its Measures, 472. Assembly of 1608, 473. The Popish Lords relapse, 473. Two Courts of High Commission erected, 475. Act of Parliament authorising the King to prescribe Churchmen's Apparel, 475. Assembly of 1610, and its Acts setting up Episcopacy, 476. Scotch Bishops proceed to London to receive Consecration, 479. The Parliament ratifies the Acts of the Assembly of 1610, 480. Vestiges of Popery, 481. Martyrdom of Ogilvy, a Jesuit, 481. Assembly of 1616, 482. James revisits Scotland, 483. The Parliament meets, 484. The Protest of the Presbyterian Ministers, 485. The Publication of the "Book of Sports," 486. Assembly of 1617, 487. Assembly at Perth in August 1618, 488. The Five Articles of Perth, 490. Nonconformists, 491. The Synod of Dort, 492. Mrs Welsh and the King, 493. Death and Character of James VI., 494.

CHAPTER XVI.

Accession of Charles I., 494. The beginning of his English Troubles, 495. He visits Scotland and is Crowned, 496. Introduction of the Anglican Ritual, 497. Meeting of the Estates, 498. Opposition to some Acts, 499. Lord Balmerino condemned, 500. Digression in regard to Teinds and Stipends, 500. Digression in regard to Parish Schools, 506. Spottiswood made Lord Chancellor, 511. Charles resolves to introduce a New Liturgy, 511. Notices of the Old Liturgy, 512. The Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical, 513. Laud's Liturgy, 514. Tumult in the Church of St Gile, 516. The Prosecution of Alexander Henderson, 519. The King rebukes the Council for suspending the use of the Liturgy, 519. Riots in Edinburgh, 520. Constitution of the Tables, 523. The King publishes a Proclamation, 524. The Presbyterians resolve to bind themselves together in a Religious Covenant, 526. Subscription of the Covenant at the Greyfriars Church in Edinburgh, 527. Different Opinions about the Covenant, 529.

THE

CHURCH HISTORY OF SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER I.

At the time when the Great Founder of our Faith was preaching his Gospel in the cities of Galilee, the inhabitants of this island were practising Druidical rites under the shadow of their ancient oaks.

The elder Pliny derives the name Druid from the Greek word "*drus*," which signifies an oak; but though there be in the words a striking similarity of sound, it is much more natural to think that Celtic priests would be called by a name native to the Celtic speech. *Druidh*, signifying a sage, is a word still used in some of the Celtic dialects, and it is evidently the name formerly applied to the priests. Cæsar tells us, that in his day the Druidical religion prevailed in Gaul and Britain;[1] but he gives us only some very scanty notices regarding its nature; and the knowledge derived from his Commentaries is not greatly supplemented by the information to be gleaned from other sources. It appears, however, to have borne some resemblance to that taught by the Magi of Persia, the Brahmins of India, and the priests of Tyre. So great a likeness is it said to have had to the Phœnician faith, that some antiquaries have imagined it must have been communicated to our forefathers by those Phœnician merchants who are known to have traded with our country for tin, long before the era of Christianity. The idea is chimerical: for a solitary galley touching perhaps once a year upon the coast, with a crew more eager to make rich by lucrative barter than to gain merit by disseminating truth, could never give religion to lands stretching through fifteen degrees of latitude. Besides, it is needless; religions, like languages, present affinities

---

[1] Cæsar. De Bello Gallico, lib. vi. He imagines it originated in Britain and was translated thence into Gaul.

which point to a common source from which they have originally sprung, and speak, moreover, of those religious instincts which are common to every human heart.

There are circumstances which lead us to believe that the Druids had some idea that there was but one Supreme God; but, be this as it may, if the classical writers are to be credited, they were in the habit of sacrificing to a multitude of Gods. Their chief divinity they identified with the sun, the most glorious object in nature, the fountain of life and light, presenting to uninstructed people the highest emblem of the deity; and which, therefore, has been worshipped on the plains of Chaldea and in the golden temples of Peru, among the ancient Canaanites, and the ancient Britons. It seems to be but too true that they were in the habit, occasionally at least, of sacrificing to their divinities human victims; but we should not wonder at this, for it has been characteristic of almost every system of superstition. Our Pagan ancestors, in this respect, were not worse than others; and it were a piece of foolish vanity in us to believe them to have been better. The maxim of the Mosaic law, that without shedding of blood there could be no remission of sin, was known far beyond the limits of Judea; and it appears to have been an article in the Druidical creed, that nothing but the life of a man could atone for the life of a man.[1] The victims in these horrid rites were generally chosen from criminals, or captives taken in war, as the sacrifice of these was believed to be peculiarly pleasing to the Gods. It was common for a private person afflicted with any serious disease, or before going to battle, to vow such a sacrifice. At other times great public sacrifices were made; upon which occasions the priests formed huge images of wicker-work, and filling these with living human beings, set them on fire, as an offering to their cruel Gods.[2]

The Druids appear to have had some glimmering conceptions of a future state: which they made use of to inspire the people with a contempt of death. Cæsar and Diodorus say that they taught the doctrine of the transmigration of souls; Lucan and Marcellinus speak of them as teaching that the soul, after death, ascended to a higher orb, where it enjoyed a more perfect repose.[3] Perhaps, they may have combined both ideas, and believed that the spirit, after leading a wan-

---

[1] Cæsar, lib. vi.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid. Diodorus Siculus, Bibl. 5. Lucan, Phars. i. Ammianus Marcellinus, xv.

dering life for a time, and inhabiting sometimes a human, sometimes a bestial abode, rose to their *Flaith-innis*,[1] or isle of the happy. It is recorded of them, with what truth we do not vouch, that their faith in a future state was so firm, that they gave loans of money to each other, to be repaid when they reached the abodes of the blessed. "I should call them fools"—says Valerius Maximus, who narrates this circumstance —"were it not that Pythagoras, in his flowing robes, believed the same as these men in trews."[2] We greatly doubt if the Greek philosopher would have given such a proof of the strength of his faith.

The ethics of the Druidical system appear to have been purer than the generality of pagan codes. The people were taught "to reverence the Gods, to do nothing evil, and to practise manly virtue."[3] As is the case with all barbarous nations, they esteemed strength and courage in battle before everything else. One custom they had which appears to us not only immoral but disgusting—it was common for near relatives to have a community of wives.[4] All superstitions have forbidden some kind of food to their votaries, either from its pretended sanctity or its supposed uncleanness. The ancient Briton refused to eat the hare, the hen, or the goose; the modern Briton, less scrupulous and more wise, devours them all.[5]

Druidism had its festivals; and of these, two were regarded with especial respect. The first was held at the beginning of May, and was called *Bailtein*, or fire of Bel. The chief ceremony of this high day consisted in kindling a huge bonfire on the summit of a hill, in honour of the summer's sun, whose return was thus welcomed to our northern climate. The other great festival was called *Samhainn*, or fire of peace, and was held on Hallow-eve, which still retains that name among our Celtic population. On this occasion justice was administered, quarrels adjusted, disputes solved; and the sacred fire kindled by the violent friction of two pieces of wood, from which all the fires in the district, previously put out, might be relighted.[6] It is probable that in this ceremony we see a friendly farewell to the sun for the year, and some of

---

[1] *Flaitheanas* is still the Gaelic word for heaven.

[2] Valerius Max., lib. c.

[3] Diogenes Laertius, Proœm. § 6.

[4] Cæsar, lib. v.

[5] Cæsar, lib. v. Dio Cassius adds that they abstained from fish also; but this is hardly credible, especially of those who lived on the coast.

[6] The old Romans had a custom of this kind; and so had the inhabitants of Peru.

his kindly warmth brought down from heaven by the priests and given to the people, to cheer and comfort them during the cold and gloom of the winter. Philosophers and historians have remarked how long a religious practice may linger among a people, even after the religion itself has been totally destroyed. It is easy to trace in the Roman ritual of the present day the influence of the mythology of the ancient world. Druidical ideas are scarcely yet extinct in Presbyterian countries. The kindling of fires at Beltane and at Hallow-eve has descended in some parts of the country almost to our time;[1] and many centuries after the complete establishment of Christianity, so attached were the Highlanders to this usage, that Gaelic councils had to forbid it on pain of death.

Besides these solemnities, the Druids observed the full moon, and also the sixth day of the moon. They regarded as sacred, not merely the oak, but the mistletoe when it grew upon it, which it rarely does, as it prefers the apple tree. Its blossom is full about the summer solstice, and its berries glisten white at the winter solstice. At these sacred seasons preparations for feasting and sacrifice were made under the trees, the holy herb was cut by the Arch-Druid with a golden bill; and it was universally regarded by the people as an antidote against poison, and a remedy for every disease.[2]

The Druids performed all their acts of worship in the open air, and generally within the religious shadows of their consecrated groves. Neither had they any images of their deities, saving those which they found in the heavenly bodies. Perhaps, like the Germans, they imagined that it derogated from the greatness of the immortal Gods to confine them within houses made with hands, or to liken them to any human form.[3] But a more natural, though a less erudite explanation of the fact may be found in the circumstance, that the Britons had as yet no architects to rear temples, nor sculptors to chisel statues. In many districts of the island, however, we find circles of huge stones set upon their ends, sometimes with a large flat stone in the centre; and these till lately were generally regarded as Druidical temples. But some of our antiquaries now maintain that they were simply burial places, as urns and calcined bones have been frequently found under the

---

[1] Rev. Dr Bisset. Statistical Account of Logierait, 1793.

[2] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, lib. xvi.

[3] Tacitus affirms this was the reason why the Germans had no temples or images.

stones, and as there is no ancient authority for connecting them with Druidism.[1] But there is nothing improbable in supposing that they were at once temples and cemeteries, for men have exhibited a very general desire to bury their dead where they worship their God. Besides, we know that standing stones were objects of worship, not only in Scotland but elsewhere. Whether temples or tombs they are interesting as the earliest effort of architectural art in the island. The only houses at that period were a clumsy contexture of stakes and the branches of trees, so flimsy that not a vestige of them now remains. The Druidical circles are as superior to these as the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus was superior to the Roman villa. Their erection, though exhibiting little art, must have required great force. The stones in several cases stand twenty feet above the surface of the soil, and must be at least half as many below it. They have retained their stability for more than two thousand years, while the finest temples of antiquity have fallen to the ground; and they bid fair to endure as long as the Egyptian pyramids. It is worthy of notice that the two best specimens now remaining to us occur at the opposite extremities of the kingdom—the one at Stonehenge, on Salisbury Plain, and the other at Stennes, in the Orkney Isles.

The Druids evidently exercised a prodigious influence over the barbarous devotees of their worship. Cæsar tells us that among the Gauls there were only two classes of any note, the Druids and the Knights; and of these the Druids appear to have been the more illustrious. Possessed of a more extensive authority than the most noble, it is not surprising, they were in general the sons of the first families. Beside their natural jurisdiction in matters of religion, they seem to have had in their hands the framing, interpreting, and executing the laws. If any one proved refractory, they interdicted him from the sacrifices; and their excommunications appear to have been as formidable as those afterwards issued by the priests of Rome. The anathematised person was shunned by all, lest they should catch the contagion of his guilt, and was reckoned an outlaw, incapable of enjoying either honour or redress.[2] Although this would now be regarded as a most unwarrantable abuse of sacerdotal power, there can be little doubt but that then it was highly beneficial. In all probability the Druids were the

---

[1] Stuart, Sculptured Stones of Scotland, vol. ii. Preface.

[2] Cæsar, lib. vi.

wisest and most virtuous men in the nation; and, in a turbulent state of society, the terrors of superstition are more effective than the rigours of law in maintaining justice and order.

No body of men could possess such power without appropriating peculiar privileges to themselves. The Druids were exempted from taxes and military service, and their persons were regarded as sacred.[1] There appears to have been three different classes of them—the priests, the prophets, and the bards. The first waited upon the sacrifices, the second observed omens and augured events, the last were the historians and poets of the time. They monopolised all the little learning of the period, and their wisdom was contained in a great number of verses, which those who studied in their schools got by memory. These they never committed to writing, although they are said to have been acquainted with the use of letters.[2] They were probably jealous lest others should become acquainted with their sacred lore, were it contained in books; for all the ancient priesthoods affected mystery, and thus increased their hold on the people. They are understood, however, to have pretended to some knowledge concerning the stars and their motions; concerning the earth and its magnitude; concerning the nature of things, and the power of the immortal Gods.[3] It were curious to inquire whether these studies were traditional and originally brought from the east, or whether the human mind has naturally, in so many cases, put forth its first strength on such researches.

Such was Druidism as described by the Roman writers; but it is certain that while such a theology and such a hierarchy as this may have existed in the Romanised provinces of Gaul and Britain, the religion of the Britons of Strathclyde and the Scots of Hibernia was of a much humbler kind, and consisted chiefly in a belief in the existence of invisible powers, whose malice might be averted by incantations and charms. They worshipped wells and stones they had set up, perhaps as rude representations of their Gods, and at these they made their bargains and their vows.[4]

The Romans, in general tolerant of the religions of the

---

[1] Cæsar, lib. vi. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] The rude wooden image recently dug out of the peat at Balachulish appears to throw doubt on the statement of the Latin writers that they had no images. Only they may have learned from the Romans this first lesson in statuary.

nations which they conquered, resolved, for some unascertained reason, to extirpate Druidism, and to exterminate its priests. Their motive is said to have been a wish to put an end to the horrid cruelty of immolating human victims; but the conquerors of the world did not in general exhibit such humanity, and it is far more likely that the patriotism of the Druids, and their power over the people in exciting them to revolt, may have made it a part of Roman policy to destroy them. The island of Anglesey, off the coast of Wales, and now united to the mainland by bridges, which are among the marvels of modern art, was the chief seat of the Druidical superstition; and thither a great number of its votaries had fled, as to the last asylum of their religion and liberties. The Roman armies followed; battle was joined on the shore; religious enthusiasm and undisciplined valour were unavailing; and a great slaughter ensued.[1] From this fatal day Druidism declined in the south of the island. Many of its priests are said to have fled northwards, and some of these are thought to have found a refuge in Iona, the earliest name of which was *Innis-nan Druidhneach*, the isle of the Druids.[2] It is singular if this little rock has been the last home of one religion, and the first chosen seat in our country of another and more blessed one. However this may be, we may be quite sure Druidism did not die in a day. It had struck its roots too deep into the soil to be thus easily plucked up. It is probable it lingered in Scotland till the sixth or seventh century; and it is certain that some of its peculiar rites and beliefs continued to haunt the country for centuries more, for vestiges of these are to be found at the present hour.[3]

But though Druidism was probably the prevailing religion

---

[1] Tacitus, Annal. xiv. 30.

[2] Origines Parochiales Scotiæ. Iona. There is also pointed out, close to the Sound of Iona, a green eminence, still called the Druids' Burial Place—Claodh nan Druidhneach, literally the Druid's Stone. See also "Statistical Account of Scotland," *Kilfinichan* and *Kilviceuen*, 1795. It is not improbable, however, that Druidh may have been applied to the monks, as it was to the Pagan priests, and that this may be the origin of these designations.

[3] Dr Burton (Hist. c. vi.) and Dr Stuart (Sculptured Stones) deny that Druids or Druidism ever existed in Scotland. I cannot carry my scepticism so far. People of the same Celtic stock occupied the northern and southern parts of the island, and the name of Druid came from the Celtic speech. It is not likely that the religion of the Britons of Kent was entirely different from that of the Britons of Strathclyde. The existence of the same sacred circles, whether temples or tombs, at the two extremities of the island, prove the identity of the usages of the people.

in Britain when the Christian era began, it was not the only one. There were other forms of superstition there already, or introduced afterwards which have left behind them a few monumental stones, and more enduring proofs of their existence in our institutions, our language, and our habits of thought. Scotland gave shelter to more races than one, and accordingly to more religions.

Tacitus calls the northern part of Britain Caledonia, and its inhabitants Caledonians. In the third century we first hear of the Picts, and a century later of the Scots—the Caledonians are no more heard of—and these two peoples begin to play the most important part in the barbarian history of the country. They were continually harassing the southern Britons, and all the armies of Rome could not subdue them. Who were these Scots and Picts, and whence came they? The Scots came from Ireland, their native seat, and settled along the western coast. From the fourth century onwards their fleets of frail, wicker-work boats were constantly landing colonies on the coast of Argyll, where they appear to have easily acquired territory, and coalesced with the aborigines, who were probably of the same Celtic stock as themselves. We may safely regard the present Highlanders as the lineal descendants of these Irish Scots with a blending of aboriginal blood. Shut in by their mountain ranges and deep glens, their blood has been preserved purer than in any other part of the island, except Wales. Their Celtic speech, their traditions, their form and features are the evidences of their descent. The genesis of the Picts is much more doubtful. They mysteriously appear on the stage, and as mysteriously vanish after a history of six hundred years. They are now thought by most archæologists to be no other than the ancient Caledonians with a new name—a name, as some say, invented by the Romans to indicate that they were fond of war-paint long after their Romanised brethren in the south had abandoned it, but it rather seems a Latinised form of the native Ffichti. Recent investigations seem to indicate, but by no means decisively, that they also were of a Celtic stock.[1] But if so, they must have had, even at a pre-Christian date, such an admixture of Teutonic blood as already to distinguish them. Tacitus tells us that the Caledonians, unlike their southern neighbours, were men of large limbs and fair hair; we learn from Adamnan that the Celtic St Columba required an interpreter when he visited the Picts;

---

[1] See Skene's Celtic Scotland, vol. i.

Bede speaks of the Picts as having a language of their own; and the population of the east and north-east of Scotland, where the Picts chiefly were, is clearly at this day not of Celtic but of Scandinavian lineage. From a period beyond history, the Norsemen in their open canoes would bravely cross the narrow sea which separates Scotland from Norway and Denmark and take possession of the land lying along the shores. and as love is stronger than hate, gradually intermarry with the natives, as the Saxons and Angles afterwards did farther south.

In the sixth century, the age of St Columba, the kingdom of the Scots appears to have included the districts of Lorn, Argyll, Knapdale, Cowal, Cantire, Lochaber, a part of Breadalbane, and perhaps the Western Isles. The Pictish territory included all the rest of the north of Scotland, from the Firths of Forth and Clyde to the Orkney Isles—in which it would appear there were two kingdoms, the northern and the southern, divided from one another by the Grampian Hills. In the south-west of the country stretching from the Clyde as far south as the Derwent in Cumberland, was the kingdom of Strathclyde, where the aboriginal Britons still held their ground, in close contiguity with their hunted compatriots in Wales. Galloway was peopled by Picts cut off from their kindred and shut up in this water-girt corner of the country.

The stream of Scandinavian blood early introduced into the island was afterwards almost continuously augmented by the incursions of the Norsemen. As far back as the dawn of history, and before it, when we have nothing but traditions to guide us, these sea-warriors would seem to have been perpetually sweeping the seas, and landing on the coast, sometimes for conquest and sometimes for plunder. Our earliest poetry, embodying the recollections of a still earlier time, is full of bloody battles fought upon the beach, and of tall pirates driven back into the wave. We have evidence that in the fourth century, and even before it, the Saxon pirates infested the northern shores of Britain. In the century following they landed in England and the south of Scotland in such numbers as to make themselves masters of the country. The Northumbrian kingdom of the Angles extended from the Humber to the Forth. In the ninth century, as we know, and probably much earlier, the Danes made incursions on our coasts. At the same period, Norwegian pirates siezed upon

the Orkney and Western Isles, and the Norsemen kept their footing in Orkney for centuries.

The mythology of Scandinavia must have entered our country with these Scandinavian tribes. Thurso in Caithness received its name from the god Thor. The nomenclature of our week we derived from the Saxons, and at least four days are called in honour of Scandinavian divinities.[1] The colonists along the northern and eastern shores, if sprung from Scandinavian mothers, must have been of the Scandinavian faith. Indeed, eminent antiquaries have held that the only religion of Caledonia was Scandinavian. We think it more probable that during several centuries the Gods of Scandinavia divided the country with the Gods of the Druids; and it is not unlikely that in the minds of an ignorant and barbarous people the two theologies may have been commingled. They had several points of resemblance; and it is to be remembered that all pagan nations have been very tolerant of each other's Gods.[2] Home records furnish us with very little information in regard to the religion of Pictland if it differed from the Druidical. Our only knowledge is derived from the life of St Columba, who converted the northern Picts to Christianity. His biographer informs us that they worshipped certain fountains, and ascribed healing virtues to them. There were other wells of which if a person drank, or washed in them, he became leprous or blind. They had their own Gods, whom they thought stronger than the God of the Christians; their priests, who could milk a bull, and raise dark mists and contrary winds.[3] Their religion, in fact, appears to have been, like that of all savage tribes, little better than a kind of fetichism, a belief in sorcery, and the existence of certain invisible and dreaded powers who could do evil; but it must be told the Christian faith when brought into collision with this low superstition is also exhibited simply as a superior sorcery. St Columba met and beat the Pictish priests on their own field, as Moses defeated the magicians of Egypt.

---

[1] Wednesday from Woden or Odin; Thursday from Thor; Friday from Freya, and Tuesday (Scottice, Tyesday) from Ty, a minor divinity popular with the Angles; Saturday probably comes from Saetir, an almost unknown Teutonic deity.

[2] So many are the points of resemblance, that Borlase, in his Antiquities of Cornwall, holds them to have been the same.

[3] Vita Sancti Columbæ. Auctore Adamnano. An edition of this interesting work was published by the Bannatyne Club; but the edition of Dr Reeves is made still more valuable by its preface and notes.

When we turn from the scanty religious records of Pictland to the Skaldic literature of Iceland, and the ancient Eddas of the north to learn something of the religion which probably prevailed at least in the north and east of the mainland, and in the swarm of islands which were held by the Norsemen, we find a much more fully developed theology, but probably it is, after all, only the popular superstition ennobled by poetry.

The primitive theology of the Scandinavian tribes appears to have embraced the doctrine of one Supreme Deity. "He liveth from all ages, He governeth all realms, and swayeth all things great and small. He hath formed heaven and earth, and the air, and all things thereunto belonging. And what is more, He hath made man, and given him a soul which shall live and never perish, though the body shall have mouldered away, or have been burnt to ashes. And all that are righteous shall dwell with Him in the place called Gimli or Vingolf; but the wicked shall go to Hel, and thence to Niflhel, which is below in the ninth world."[1] It is certain, however, that this sublime belief was confined to the few; and that inferior divinities monopolised the worship of the many, who were quite ignorant of the One Supreme.

According to the prose Edda, there were twelve Gods, in whom men were bound to believe, and to whom divine honours ought to be paid. The Goddesses were equally numerous, and "not less divine and mighty." The first and eldest of the Æsir is Woden. "He governs all things, and although the other deities are powerful, they all serve and obey him as children do their father." Thor stands next, and is the strongest of all the Gods; he is the thunderer, the war-god. He wields a mallet, with which he has split many a giant's skull, for nothing can resist its force. Baldur, the good and beautiful, and Njord follow Thor in the list of divinities; the former of whom appears to have been the patron of wisdom and eloquence; and the latter the God of the sea—the Neptune of Rome. Of the Goddesses, Frigga and Freya were the chief. Frigga was the wife of Woden, and appears to have been no other than an apotheosis of mother-earth. Freya was the Goddess of generation, the Venus of the ancients; and appears, like her southern sister, to have been possessed of resplendent beauty. "She is very fond," says the Edda, "of love ditties, and all lovers would do well to

---

[1] Prose Edda. Translated in Mallet's Northern Antiquities, p. 400-1, Bohn's edition.

invoke her." But, contrary to the usual softness of her sex, though perfectly like a Scandinavian woman, she followed armies to battle, and claimed from Woden the half of the slain.

Loki occupies a prominent place in this mythology; but his position is ambiguous. Of a fine form and amazing dexterity, he is generally in the company of the Gods, but he often brings them into trouble, and is feared and hated by them. He is called the reproach of Gods and men, and was in fact the devil of the north.

But the Norsemen peopled their invisible world with other beings than the Gods. There were the Frost giants, and the mountain giants, the dwarfs, the elves of light, and the elves of darkness; these giants being no other than the personified natural agencies which piled up around them mountains of ice and snow. Jötunheim is their abode; they are described as an ill-doing race, and against them Thor wages a remorseless war. The dwarfs were originally maggots, but, by the will of the Gods and the law of evolution, they assumed the human shape. They dwell in rocks and caverns, and brew mischief. The elves of light dwell in Elf-home; but the elves of darkness live under the earth. "The elves of light are fairer than the sun, but the elves of darkness are blacker than pitch."

The Druids venerated the oak; the Scandinavians regarded the ash as peculiarly the tree of the Gods. "It is under the ash Yggdrasill where the Gods assemble every day in council. It is the greatest and best of all trees: its branches spread over the whole world, and even reach above the heaven. Near the fountain which is under this ash stands a very beauteous dwelling, out of which go three maidens, named Urd, Vernandi, and Skuld--the Present, the Past, and the Future. These maidens fix the lifetime of all men, and are called Norns."[1]

Courage was the virtue which the Norse creed was designed to foster, and accordingly the joys of the future world were reserved for the brave. Valhalla is the spacious mansion of Woden, and thither go all who are slain in battle. It was peculiarly suited to be the dwelling-place of cut-throats and pirates. Every morning the heroes ride out to the court, and there hew each other in pieces; but when meal-time approaches, they remount their steeds, and return to dine in

---

[1] Prose Edda. From Urd comes our word *weird;* and the *weird sisters* of Shakespere are the Norns of Scandinavia.

Valhalla, all the hungrier for the deadly wounds they have given and received. The entire carcass of a boar is served as the daily dinner, and the flitches of this they wash down with deep draughts of mead, which they quaff from huge drinking-horns; and so in eating and drinking, and with boisterous merriment, they pass the night.—The voluptuous Mussulman has peopled his paradise with dark-eyed houris of refulgent beauty, four of whom are assigned to every believer who falls in battle; the Scandinavians, children of a colder clime, have introduced females into Valhalla too, but it is only "to bear in the drink, and take care of the drinking-horns, and whatever belongs to the table." "The heaven of each," says Moore, "is just what each desires;" and it must be confessed that no more fitting entertainment than that we have described could be found for a company of freebooters.

The altars of these rough Norsemen were originally in the open air, and were frequently stained with human blood; but they had afterwards roofed temples, consisting of a nave and shrine, corresponding to the chancel of the Christian Church, where were the images of the Gods, ranged in a half circle. In the midst of them was the altar with the sacred fire, the blood bowl and the ring, on which oaths were sworn. Sacrifices of every living thing were offered, not only of sheep and oxen, but of horses and swine. The chief was the priest. The offerings being made, the flesh of the victims was boiled in kettles in the nave, or less holy part of the temple, and feasting began then and there—broth and beef and horns of beer. The priest was the toast-master,—To Woden! to Njord! to Frey! to Thor! to the memory of their departed kinsmen! A jovial religion, but what else could we expect![1]

Each year had its three religious festivals. The first was held at the winter solstice, and was called Jul. This being the beginning of the Scandinavian year, it was held in honour of Frey, the Sun-God, in order to procure, from his benign influence, propitious seasons. The second festival was in honour of the earth, and was fixed at the first quarter of the second moon of the year. The third, and greatest, was celebrated in honour of Woden, early in spring, and was probably intended to incline the battle-god to be favourable to them in their piratical expeditions during the summer months.[2]

We may well believe that such a martial creed and such a

[1] Dasent's Burnt Njal. Introduction.

[2] Mallet's Northern Antiquities.

sanguinary worship would foster the marauding spirit of the Norsemen, and would lead them to think plunder and murder their proper trade. Unswerving valour was the only virtue which their religion encouraged: death in battle was the only doorway to heaven. It accordingly sent forth a race of rovers, who cruelly devastated almost every country of Europe, and drove the monks who lived along the coasts to introduce into their litany the pitiful prayer—"From the fury of the Norsemen, good Lord, deliver us."[1] The Picts may have carried this creed into our country, and it partly accounts for their relentless wars with the Britons, and afterwards with the Scots. The Saxons brought over the same Gods in their long ships to England; and in their conflicts with the natives their valour and piety would be equally inflamed by the belief that Hengist and Horsa were the lineal descendants of Woden. The Norwegians and Danes, who during so many centuries infested the northern seas, and kept their firm grip on all the islands off our coast, and even on a considerable district of the mainland, must have left there not merely the mark of blood, but of the superstition which caused them so profusely to shed it. It was the year 1000 before these corsairs were baptized into the Christian faith.

The Scandinavian mythology wants the elegance of the old classic myths, but it is vaster in all its proportions. It is like a great Gothic cathedral beside a Grecian temple. Everything about it is colossal. The body of the giant Ymir was so huge that it formed the world. Thor with one stroke of his hammer cleaves a deep glen in the earth; and, challenged to drink, takes such a draught as to cause the ebb tide along all the shores of the world. The serpent Midgard was so long that, like the snake in Hindu mythology, it encircled the globe; and the open jaws of the wolf Fenrir stretched from earth to heaven. In such a mythology there were no pretensions to much spirituality, but neither was there any voluptuous sensuality. It was plainly the religion of a robust people and a rigorous clime. It was the reflex of the people's own thoughts and employments. They deified and worshipped what they admired. Man ever makes his Gods in his own image; he trembles before the enlarged shadow of himself.

Paganism has now been extinct in Great Britain for more

---

[1] A furore Normanorum, libera nos, Domine.—Note to Mallet's Antiquities.

than twelve hundred years; but it has left behind it traces of its existence, which seem to be almost as indelible and enduring as those fossil vestiges which recall the memory of former worlds, with their strange types of animals and plants. Beltane, the title till recently applied to our Whitsunday, was the name of a Druidical festival; Yule, by which Christmas is still frequently denominated in Scotland, is identical with Jul,[1] a Scandinavian feast held at Christmas time, with joy and rejoicing, in honour of Frei. Every time we speak of Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, we commemorate a Scandinavian God. It has sometimes been said that our elves and fairies were imported from the east; they are in truth the creations of the north, and it will be many centuries before they cease to haunt the minds of our children, and to give merriment to all by their gay and innocent gambols. The ghosts of Ossian still hover on the Highland hills, and walk in lonely churchyards; and many a Celt who could fearlessly rush up the heights of Alma, would not for worlds spend a night alone in a haunted house, or approach and examine a moonbeam flickering on the mound of a grave. The bards and senachies who once were to be found in every Highland hall were the descendants of the Druids, all whose science and history were in verse; and though poets are no longer entertained by kings and chiefs, yet the last of our minstrels has not sung. Philosophical historians have regarded the enormous power possessed by the priesthood of Rome in Western Europe as in part an inheritance derived from their Druidical ancestors, for rude nations naturally transfer from one sacerdotal caste to another the same veneration, influence, and respect.

It has been thought by some that every time we circulate the wine at table from right to left, we have respect to the Druids, who in all their movements most scrupulously followed the course of the sun. When we drink healths we show our Scandinavian descent. The Norsemen, as we have seen, were accustomed to pledge their Gods in their cups, more especially Woden, Thor, and Freya; and when Christianity was at length

---

[1] This becomes more apparent when we remember that in the Germanic and Northern tongues the J is pronounced like our Y.

"The fire that's blawn on Beltane e'en
May weel be black gin Yule;
But blacker far awaits the heart
When first fond love grows cule."
MOTHERWELL'S *Jeanie Morrison.*

introduced, unable to abandon the custom, they substituted in the place of these the names of Christ, the saints, and more especially of the archangel Michael, whom they regarded as the greatest warrior of the hosts of heaven. At these drinking-bouts they moreover pledged one another, and drank to the spirits of their departed heroes.

Both the Scandinavian and Druidical priesthoods sanctioned, in cases of doubtful guilt, the trial by ordeal, in which it was understood there was a direct appeal to heaven to clear the innocent. This practice continued long throughout all Europe after the reception of Christianity. It gave rise to the chivalrous tournament, and degenerated into the duel, now happily abolished as the last vestige of a barbarous usage, founded on the impious presumption that Providence will interfere in our quarrels to right the wrong.

Religions follow the universal law—they do not perish, they change. Druidism and Scandinavianism gradually merged into Christianity, but traces of the old faiths remained imbedded in the new. The first missionaries recognised and acted on a knowledge of this. The heathen temples were purged of their images, and consecrated as Christian churches. The standing stones were carved with Christian symbols. The pagan festivals were converted into Christian holidays, and probably in many cases the rude people hardly knew that they had turned from one religion to another. It is certain that under the name of Christians they practised for a thousand years pagan rites without knowing what they did.

CHAPTER II.

Eusebius, in the first chapter of his "Ecclesiastical History," frankly confesses that he was totally unable to find even the bare vestiges of those who had travelled the way before him; "unless, perhaps," he proceeds to say, "what is only presented in the slight intimations which some in different ways have transmitted to us in certain partial narratives of the times in which they lived; who, raising their voices before us, like torches at a distance, and as looking down from some commanding height, call out and exhort us where we should walk, and whither direct our course with certainty and safety:"[1] The

---

[1] Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus, book i. chap. i.

person who undertakes to narrate the early ecclesiastical history of Scotland must make a similar acknowledgment. It is not that there is any lack of materials wherewithal to build up a consecutive and most interesting narrative. There are ancient chronicles and monkish legends in great plenty; but it is very evident to the searching eye of criticism, that in most of these falsehood is largely mingled with truth; and that when Memory failed to record an event, Imagination was ever at hand to supply the deficiency. In our estimate of these documents, it must, moreover, be borne in mind that few of them were written till centuries after the period whose history they pretend to relate, and though some of them probably proceeded upon documents more ancient than themselves, and which are now lost, it is certain that a large number of the circumstances they narrate must have come to them through the uncertain channel of tradition. Gildas, our earliest chronicler, lived probably toward the end of the sixth century; but who or what he was, no one can certainly tell. The venerable Bede compiled his valuable work in the beginning of the eighth century. To us, looking across the eighteen hundred years which have elapsed since the birth of our Saviour, three or four centuries at its very commencement may seem to be a short space; as when a man standing on a high hill, and gazing over a wide landscape, many miles at its utmost limit appear contracted into a span. But the former is a mental, as the latter is an ocular deception, both arising from the same law, that distance lessens the apparent magnitude of objects. Three hundred years at the beginning of our era were quite as long as three hundred years now, and must have had the same effects—removing ancient land-marks, wearing out old ideas, and bearing down upon their muddy waters the memories of a myriad events, and depositing them in the depths of the great sea of oblivion. Without the aid of contemporaneous history, and forced to depend entirely upon unwritten tradition, how little could we know of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and that little how distorted. All experience warrants us to say that no narrative is worthy of belief which is not vouched by a consecutive line of writers who lived at the time to which the records refer.

It is true that many sidelights are let in upon the early history of our country by the Latin writers who lived at the time, but their notices refer almost exclusively to political events. The Fathers of the Church, also, sometimes allude to the introduction of Christianity into our island, but they lived too

far from the scene to be accurately informed, and some of their passages have the evident marks of African warmth or Oriental exaggeration. The monks, within whose cloisters all the learning of Europe was for centuries locked up, and from whom countless legends and saintly lives have come down to us, were men of most lively fancy, who esteemed pious fraud to be a virtue, and were equally ready to forge a charter, or invent a miracle, if they could thereby benefit their monastery, or glorify the Church. The truth is, we must traverse almost a thousand years before we get beyond the region of fable, and reach the known land of historic truth.

Although our antiquaries have spared no pains to recover and authenticate every fragment of the past, the mythical has been steadily gaining upon the historical, from the severe tests which every fact must now undergo before we recognise it as a reality. Buchanan claims much merit to himself for having discarded those legends which carry our history up to Scota, the daughter of the Pharaoh who was drowned in the Red Sea; and thinks that he places our dynasty on a secure basis when he begins it with a certain Fergus, who is said to have reigned in Scotland when Alexander the Great was besieging Babylon. Lord Hailes begins his Annals fourteen hundred years after this, with the reign of Malcolm III., remarking, that "previous to that period our history is involved in obscurity and fable;" and thus reduces eighty-five of Buchanan's kings to little better than shadows, dimly seen through the mist of years, albeit the grim portraits of some of them still adorn the walls of Holyrood. Tytler begins his admirable history two centuries later, at the accession of Alexander III., knowing that from that time he could build his narrative on unquestionable muniments. In like manner, the critical researches of the learned Niebuhr have reduced the history of Rome to less than a half of its former bulk. The same severity of criticism applied to the chronicles of Gildas, Nennius, Bede, Geoffrey of Monmouth, William of Malmesbury, Hector Boethius, Fordun, and the legendary lives of the legion of saints who crowd the calendar, would make whole chapters shrink into a single page. But notwithstanding this huge mass of superincumbent fable, we think it possible, in many cases, to separate the true from the false; as, besides collateral circumstances, truth often possesses a kind of internal evidence of its own. Many undoubted facts connected with the history of the Scottish Church have been floated down to us

from a very remote antiquity, and to gather these up, and carefully preserve them, has always been a labour of Christian love.

Seven cities of antiquity are said to have contended for the honour of having been the birthplace of Homer; and no fewer than five of the apostles compete for the merit of having first preached the gospel in Britain. These are St James, Simon Zelotes, Philip, St Peter, and St Paul. Besides these five apostles, Joseph of Arimathea, who charged himself with the burial of our Saviour, has likewise been set up by the monkish historians as the first who planted Christianity on our shores. Leaving Apostolic times, there is a story of a certain Lucius, King of Britain, who, in the second century, sent an embassy to the Pope, desiring to be converted and baptised. Not to be far behind, Scotland boasts of a King Donald who, in the third century, with his whole kingdom, embraced Christianity. But both stories are so full of inconsistencies and anachronisms, that we need have no difficulty in rejecting them as monkish myths. It is highly probable, however, that the religion of the Nazarene had already penetrated into Britain, and had even been heard of in the forests of Caledonia. Tertullian declares that in his day parts of Britain, inaccessible to the Romans, had been subdued to Christ, and three British bishops are said to have attended the first Council of Arles in the year 314, and other three the Council of Rimini in 359. It is thought by some there is a witness in stone of the existence of Christianity in Scotland in the fourth century. "Nowhere in Great Britain," says Dean Stanley, "is there a Christian record so ancient as the grey weather-beaten column which now serves as the gate-post of the deserted churchyard of Kirk Madrine, on the bleak hill in the centre of the Rinns of Galloway, and bearing on its battered surface, in letters of the fourth century, the statement that it had marked the grave of three saints of Gallic name—Florentius, Viventius, and Mavorius."[1] The rudeness of the monument and its desolate site are in fine keeping with the future history of the country's faith.

There is a legend in regard to the introduction of Christi-

---

[1] Lectures on the History of the Church of Scotland, p. 85. See also Burton's History, vol. i. chap. iv., and Stuart's Sculptured Stones, vol. ii. The inscription below an encircled + on the one pillar is, Hic jacent scī et præcipui sacerdotes id est, Viventius, Mavorius—and on the other pillar is the name Florentius.

anity into Scotland too characteristic to be omitted, more especially as it is connected with St Andrew, the patron saint of the nation. St Regulus, better known in our country as St Rule, is said to have been a Greek monk, who, being warned in a dream that he should take the bones of St Andrew, and depart with them to some unknown land in the far west, resolved, after some hesitation, to obey the Divine admonition. He accordingly gathered up what relics he could of the apostle, viz., an arm-bone, three fingers, three toes, and a tooth; and, being accompanied by sixteen other monks and three devout virgins, he set sail, not knowing whither to steer his course. For two long years were this pilgrim band tossed about by tempests, as they skirted the sunny shores of the Mediterranean, passed the dreaded pillars of Hercules, and rode in the Bay of Biscay; but, at last overtaken by a storm more violent than any they had yet encountered, they were whirled northward, and finally shipwrecked on the promontory of St Andrews. With difficulty they escaped from the waves, bearing with them the precious relics of the apostle. But on the shore there were dangers as well as on the sea. The whole country was covered with a vast forest, which was infested by wild boars; and the Pictish inhabitants, painted pagans, were scarcely less to be dreaded. But the king was awed by the holy lives of the saintly company, and in a short time he and his subjects submitted to the rite of baptism. Hard by the ruins of the once noble cathedral of St Andrews there still stands a lofty tower of undoubted antiquity. It is called St Regulus's tower. Some have imagined it belongs to the fourth or fifth century; but with far greater probability it is ascribed to the twelfth, and believed to be part of the basilica known to have been erected by one of the earliest bishops of the See. The legend belongs to the year 369.

We cannot dismiss this legend without remarking, that many eminent historians are inclined to assign to the British churches an Eastern rather than a Roman origin. Neander is of this number.[1] They are led to do so by the supposed fact, that for many ages the Scotch Church agreed much more

---

[1] General History of the Christian Religion and Church, vol. v. § 1, Bohn's Edition. No authority is higher than Neander's; and yet we have doubts of the Eastern origin of the British Church. It was more likely that the Roman missionary would follow in the steps of the Roman soldier; and the dependence was not felt, just because it was the twelfth century before the Roman hierarchy managed to stretch its dominion so wide.

closely with the Greek than the Latin Church in many of its rites; and claimed for itself an Asiatic origin, always appealing to St Polycarp, St Mark, and St John, as the sources of the traditions it enjoyed. It is possible there may be a grain of truth in the story of St Rule.

It was in this age a controversy arose in the Church regarding Grace and Free Will, than which none is more memorable, both from the interesting questions it involved, and the illustrious disputants it brought upon the field. This controversy arose out of certain opinions published by Pelagius, and defended with great logical acumen by his disciple Cælestius, one or both of whom are said to have been of British or Scottish birth. When the controversy was at its hottest St Augustine, the great opponent of Pelagius, was joined by an invaluable ally in St Jerome. This monk was perhaps the most learned man of his day, but certainly the worst-tempered and most vituperative; and he seems to have anticipated other learned men in his thorough contempt for the Scotch. In the abuse which he lavished upon Pelagius, it is thought we have a clue to the place of his birth. It would appear Pelagius was a portly man, and St Jerome seizes upon this to taunt him with being swollen with Scotch porridge.[1] The same Father, in his preface to his third book upon the prophet Jeremiah, again breaks out against Pelagius, calls him a Highland terrier, and declares that, being sprung from the nation of the Scots, in the neighbourhood of the Britons, he ought, like Cerberus, to be well beaten with a spiritual club, and, with his master Pluto, consigned to eternal silence.[2] Others of his adversaries spoke of him in the same abusive way. Orosius says he had broad shoulders, a thick neck, a fat face, was lame, and blind of an eye.[3] Augustine alone had the magnanimity to do him

---

[1] Nec recordator stolidissimus et Scotorum pultibus prægravatus. (Præf. in lib. i., Com. in Hierem.)

[2] "Hic tacet, alibi criminatur, mittit in universam orbem Epistolas Biblinas, prius auriferas, nunc maledicas, ipseque mutus latrat, per Alpinum [Albinum] Canem, grandem et corpulentum, et qui calcibus magis sævire possit, quam dentibus. Habet enim progeniem Scoticæ gentis, de Britannorum vicinia; qui juxta fabulas poetarum, instar Cerberi, spirituali percutiendus est clava, ut æterno cum suo Magistro Plutone, silentio conticescat." The persons indicated in this passage are doubtful. Cardinals Norris and Baronius and Archbishop Usher have thought that Pelagius and his disciple Cælestius are referred to; other scholars hold that it is to Rufinus (the master of Pelagius) and Pelagius himself that Jerome alludes.

[3] "Latos humeros gestantem robustamque cervicem, præferentem etiam in fronte pinguedinem, mutilum et μονόφθαλμον." (Oros. in Apol. de Arbitrii Liber: contra Pelag.)

justice. "He was a good man, and an eminent Christian," said the Bishop of Hippo. "I have loved him, and I love him still.[1]

Augustine spoke only the truth when he said Pelagius was a virtuous and pious man. A layman, and probably a monk, he had spent the greater part of his life in seclusion. Away from the world he had not felt the power of its temptations; endowed by nature with an easy temperament, he had scarcely known the turbulence of evil passions, and hence had been led to deny our depravity, and to think perfect virtue attainable by man. St Austin was a man of another mould, and had lived a very different life. Possessed of violent passions, which in early youth he had been unable to control, he had run a wild career of debauchery and unbelief. It was not without an inward agony that he had passed from death unto life. He felt it was only the grace of God that could work such a change; that it was only the mercy of God that could save such a sinner. In the heart and history of these two great men we may thus find the seeds of their respective systems. But something must also be attributed to their marked diversity of intellect. The controversy is not yet settled. It was revived in many of its essential points in the contending tenets of Arminius and Calvin; and probably it will divide the Christian Church till the end of time.

We have now reached the fifth century without being able to discover the footprints of the apostle who first preached the gospel in Britain. Yet we have now indubitable evidence that it had been preached, and that many had received it with all gladness. History has not recorded the event. The small seed had been sown in secret, which was to become the greatest of all trees, and overshadow with its branches all the nations of the world. But though we cannot distinctly trace the introduction of Christianity to our shores, there is no need of resorting to mystery or miracle to account for it. Within a century from the death of the Nazarene, He could not but be heard of in Britain; for the good tidings of the new religion had been too much talked of everywhere not to be heard of here. It was startling to see how the old worn-out religions fell to the ground before the religion of Jesus, as Dagon had fallen and been broken to pieces in the presence of the ark. The Romans talked of this as they sauntered about the Forum,

---

[1] "Vir, ut audio, sanctus nec parvo præfectu Christianus, bonus ac prædicandus vir." (St Aug. de Peccat. Mer.)

when they met at the baths, and when, reclining at dinner, they observed the old fashion of pouring out libations of wine to their Gods. Even those who despised the new faith, and esteemed it an odious superstition, could not refrain from speaking of it, for it had become a great fact. Thus the religion of Jesus flew—His name went out through all the earth, and His words to the end of the world.

At this period there was a constant intercourse between Rome and Britain. Roman traders were continually touching on the coast, and penetrating into the interior. Roman legionaries were in the islands by thousands, from the rude *miles* up to the accomplished *centurio* and the all-powerful *imperator*. Roman colonies had been formed in several districts of the south. All these must have come into daily contact with the natives, and we know that by that contact these natives were rapidly civilized. Amongst all these traders legionaries, and colonists, was there not one Christian, who would seize upon some propitious opportunity to tell an inquiring Briton of the great prophet who had recently appeared in Judea? When everything else was discussed, was this subject never once mentioned? When the naked barbarians were told how to clothe their persons, and how to plough their fields; when they were generously presented with the seeds of many of those plants which now enrich our gardens with the fruits of Italy and the Euxine; when Roman temples, villas, and baths began to rise, and Roman luxury to be everywhere introduced, was there no channel by which that new religion, which had already filled Rome with its martyrs and confessors, could find an introduction too?

We have reason to believe, that before the expiry of the second century a considerable proportion of the Roman population had become Christian. Many of the soldiery were professors of the new faith. In a campaign against the Marcomanni, when Marcus Antoninus was emperor, the army was surrounded by the enemy, and reduced to the most desperate condition for want of water. They were relieved from their distress by a sudden storm of thunder and rain, which struck terror into the barbarians, and gave refreshment to them. By many this was attributed to the prayers of the numerous Christians in one of the legions, which was ever afterwards known as the *thundering legion*.[1] We mention this, not to claim it as a miracle, but simply to prove that many Chris-

---

[1] Mosheim, II. Cent., part i. chap. i.

tians were in the ranks, and that, of those who were stationed in Britain, there may have been some who, like good soldiers of the cross, began to subdue the island to Christ.

In order to feel this fully, we must bear in mind the diffusive character of Christianity, and the missionary spirit which animated all its first converts. Judaism was narrow and exclusive, and the descendant of Abraham rejoiced in the thought that he and his countrymen alone had the hope of salvation. Paganism was easy and tolerant, and the polite Roman, while himself preferring the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus, had no fault to find with the Egyptian at the shrine of Ra. It was thought there was even a propriety in every province having its own divinities; and as the army added country after country to the empire, the senate made no scruple of admitting its Gods to the Pantheon. But Christianity was a religion of a different type; it still bore upon its brow the old Hebrew commandment—"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." It had no toleration for other Gods than the true God. It had no belief in any other way of salvation than the one way. But with this intolerance of other faiths, it combined a liberality worthy of its divine Author, who makes His sun to rise and His rains to descend upon every created thing. It did not seek to confine its benefits to a few; it desired to extend them to all. It aimed at the empire of the world. The commission had been given to preach the gospel to every creature, and every new disciple felt that a necessity was laid upon him to communicate to others the joyful secret himself had received. The very exclusiveness of the system gave to this diffusive spirit in its converts an additional intensity, for it was believed that men could not escape if they neglected this great salvation. The narrowness of the channel increased the depth and impetuosity of the stream. Every Christian was in haste to bring others to Christ, lest, through delay, they might be eternally lost. Thus this new and divine religion united at once the earnestness of Judaism with the wide catholicity of the pagan creed.

From this we may well believe, that if in the crowd of foreigners who visited Britain there was one Christian, he would not be silent regarding the faith he had embraced. Men did not then wait till they were invested with apostolic authority or ministerial character before they would open their lips about the love of Jesus—they went everywhere preaching

the gospel. It is highly probable it was some pious legionary or some converted trader who first told our ancestors of the way to heaven. His name is not written in history but his influence is living and operating still. The work of conversion would at first be slow, just as we see it is now in Africa, India, or China. In general it requires centuries to turn a people from an old faith to a new one; and it is rare indeed that a nation is born in a day. But the work being begun would go steadily on, for Druidism, with its cruel rites, could not ultimately withstand the mild and merciful religion of Jesus. Every new convert gained would be in reality a new apostle set apart for the preaching of the Word; and the massacre of the Druids in Mona, like the burning of the temple at Jerusalem, would remove a great obstacle to the triumph of the cross. Thus strangely is the wrath of man overruled to subserve the purposes of an eternal Providence.

It is more than probable that Christianity made its way to Scotland from the south. With converts in one end of the island, it could not but be heard of in the other. It has been supposed by many that the persecution by Diocletian, which raged throughout the whole empire in the end of the third century, would lead many British Christians to take refuge in the mountains beyond the Roman wall, and thus introduce Christianity into our country. There is good reason, however, to believe that under the mild government of Constantius, Britain suffered very little from this persecution, and though the names of two or three martyrs are preserved, we know that in general, while churches were thrown down, life was respected and spared. There was nothing to occasion a flight to the north. But a persecution was not required to scatter throughout the island the seed of the Word. The natural intercourse betwixt the north and the south was enough to effect it. We may safely say that, within fifty years after Christianity was known in Middlesex and Devon, it would be heard of at least in Clydesdale and Perth. What more likely than that some converted Briton, burning with apostolic ardour, would carry to his Celtic brethren in the north the message of mercy, and make our glens for the first time to echo the high praises of God.

It is evident that, though Christianity was early known in Caledonia, it was a long time before it made any visible progress. In the sixth century the Northern Picts are still spoken

of as heathens,[1] and probably it was a hundred years more ere the bulk of the people were baptized into Christ. Instead of wondering at this, we should rather be surprised that it made any converts at all among a people so rude as our ancestors, all whose habits and propensities were opposed to the peaceful and forgiving spirit of the gospel. In order to understand the difficulties with which it had to struggle, and the beneficial change it has wrought, we must try and discover what we can of the state of our country during the first centuries of the Christian era.

The central district of the kingdom was covered with one vast forest, called the Caledonian wood,[2] vestiges of which still remain in those extensive peat-mosses we still meet with; and from which we occasionally dig huge trunks of blackened oak, the remains of trees which stretched out their branches to the sky when the Romans were entrenched at Ardoch and Dunglass. This forest gave shelter to enormous wild boars,[3] and formidable packs of wolves, which were not extirpated till more than a thousand years after the time we refer to. Those parts of the country which were not covered with wood were either bare mountains or impassable fens, through which the naked aborigines swam or waded, with the mud and water up to their waist, with the same agility as the wild duck splutters through the reeds of a marsh; but the heavy-armed legionaries could cross them only on mounds of earth, which were formed with infinite labour and expense. The population of such a country must have been extremely sparse; and we probably exceed the truth when we estimate it at two hundred thousand, less than half of the present population of Glasgow alone. The soil, not yet subjected to the plough, could not sustain more.

They had no other habitation than miserable huts formed of wattles and the branches of trees. They had no clothing but the skin of a wild beast thrown across their shoulders; but they painted their naked bodies, as savage tribes frequently do, either from feelings of vanity, or to make themselves look more terrible to their enemies in battle. Gildas declares they were more anxious to shroud their villanous faces in bushy hair than

---

[1] Gentiles barbari. (Adamnani Vita Columbæ.)

[2] "Ad occidentem Vararis habitabant Caledonii, proprie sic dicti, quorum regionis partem tegebat immensa illa Caledonia sylva." (Ricardi Corinensis, "De situ Britanniæ," lib. i. cap. vi.)

[3] Muckross was the ancient name of St Andrews, which means the "boars' promontory."

to cover other parts of their bodies with decent clothing.[1] They lived by hunting and pasturing flocks of sheep and cattle; but war seems to have been their principal trade. They led, in short, a savage life, and savage life has no varieties; in all countries and periods it is the same. One of our antiquaries declares the Dalriad Scots to have been savages in the extreme, with habits differing little from those of the Hottentots;[2] and St Jerome, whose love for our nation we have already seen, affirms, that when a young man in Gaul, he had seen some Scots regaling themselves with human flesh;[3] and that it was known they had a fine appreciation of the most delicate morsels. He does not explain how he managed to witness such a spectacle.

Such was the people among whom Christianity had now to make its way. It could be no triumphal march, but a slow and painful progress over opposing prejudice and passions. The contrast between the present and the past, to which Christianity has largely contributed, is among the proudest of the many trophies it has won.

CHAPTER III.

ST NINIAN[4] is the first preacher of Christianity in Scotland whose name has come down to us. The time and place of his birth are doubtful; but, like almost all the saints of early times, he is declared to have been of royal blood; and we know it was in the beginning of the fifth century that he laboured among the Galwegians and southern Picts. He is briefly mentioned by Bede "as a most reverend bishop and holy man of the British nation, who had been regularly instructed at Rome in the faith and mysteries of the truth."[5]

---

[1] Hist., sect. 19.

[2] Pinkerton. (See his Inquiry.)

[3] Quid loquar de cæteris nationibus, cum ipse adolescentulus in Gallia Scotos, Britannicam gentem, humanis vesci carnibus viderim? Lib. ii., ad Jovian: cap. vi.

[4] Frequently corrupted into Rinian, Trinian, and Ringan. It is to this saint Friar John addresses his matins:—

Awake, O Reinian; ho, awake;
Awake, O Reinian, ho:
Get up, you no more sleep must take;
Get up, for we must go.
Rabelais, by Sir THOS. URQUHART.

[5] Ecclesiastical History, book iii., chap. iv.

His biography was written by Abbot Ailred in the twelfth century; but it is meagre of facts, and abounds with miracles, and very little reliance can be placed upon it. He is said to have gone to Rome in his youth and studied there, and the Pope learning that in the western parts of Briton there were some people who had not yet received the faith, and others who had heard it from heretics, sent him back to his native country to convert the heathen and confound the heretics. On his way home he visited St Martin of Tours, then at the height of his renown. When he returned, we are told "there was great joy among all, and wonderful devotion, and the praise of Christ sounded out on all sides." Straightway "he began to root up what had been ill planted; to cast down what had been ill built; and to lay the foundations of a true faith."[1] Having fixed his residence in Galloway, the holy man set about building a church of stone on the shores of the Solway, assisted by masons he had brought from France. This is said to have been the first stone structure erected in the country, and if so, for this alone, Ninian deserves the eternal gratitude of his countrymen. From its white and glistening aspect, seen over the bay of Wigton, it was called in Latin *Candida Casa*, in Saxon, *Hwitherne*, a designation which has survived in Whithorn till the present day. While the church was yet building, Ninian received intelligence that his friend and patron, St Martin, had migrated to heaven, upon which he piously resolved to dedicate his church to his honour.[2] This enables us to fix the date of its erection, for we know that St Martin died about A.D. 400.

Having set everything right among the Galwegians, he resolved upon a mission to convert the southern Picts, who are described as still worshipping deaf and dumb idols. It was probably into Stirling and Perthshire that he penetrated, and he had only to come to conquer. "To the font of the saving laver run rich and poor, young and old, men and maidens, mothers and children, and, renouncing Satan with all his works and pomps, they are joined to the body of the believers by faith, by confession, by the sacraments."[3] Rather startling language to be used of the barbarian Picts, who at that very time were waging a relentless war against the Britons, butchering all, sparing none. "The barbarians," said they pitifully, "drive us to the sea, the sea drives us back to the barbarians." It was among such wild marauders Ninian

---

[1] Vita Niniani Auctore Ailredo Revallensi, c. ii.

[2] Ibid. c. iii.

[3] Ibid. c. vi.

laboured, and one cannot but applaud his heroism; but it is evident that while he may have persuaded many to submit to the rite of baptism—sometimes not difficult with savages—he did not manage to change their nature, or to inoculate them with the peaceful spirit of the gospel. But the unhesitating biographer proceeds to say that "he ordained presbyters, consecrated bishops, distributed ecclesiastical dignities, and divided the whole land into parishes."[1] It is difficult to believe that the rude Galwegians were infected with Pelagianism early in the fifth century, as is plainly insinuated; still more difficult to believe that a whole hierarchy existed at that period among the Picts. It is evident the Abbot of Rievaulx has transferred the sentiments and facts of his own age to those of Ninian, as is plain from this one circumstance, that parishes were not created in Scotland till the eleventh or twelfth century.

But enough remains for the glory of St Ninian. Enough surely to have been the pioneer of Christianity in Scotland—to have been the first to preach the gospel to the Picts—the first to teach the Galwegians to build their houses of stone. We cannot but believe he was a good and heroic man, who laboured hard in his Master's work among barbarous tribes; and though he cast the good seed on rough and rocky ground, some of it found root in the crevices, and sprung up, and in future years bore its fruit. His name is for ever associated with the origin of Scottish piety. Canonized by Rome, and celebrated by monkish fables, he is more to be envied in that his memory is embalmed in the hearts of the Christian children of those pagan barbarians amongst whom he toiled and died, and in that he will be kept in everlasting remembrance by the villages, churches, and wells called by his name.

We now meet with another historic name; but its light is of a phosphoric kind, shewing itself, but nothing beyond. "In the eighth year of the reign of Theodosius," says Bede, "Palladius was sent by Celestinus, the Roman pontiff, to the Scots that believed in Christ to be their first bishop."[2] This

---

[1] Vita Niniani Auctore Ailredo Revallensi, c. vi.

[2] "Ecclesiastical History," Book I. chap. xiii. The words of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle are:—"A.D. 430. This year Palladius the bishop was sent to the Scots by Pope Celestinus, that he might confirm their faith." An amusing controversy has been waged as to whether "first" in Bede is to be understood in respect of time or position. Some episcopal writers have maintained that *primus episcopos* does not mean the first bishop who ever entered Scotland (or Ireland), but indicates that Palladius was sent to be primate.

statement is confirmed by the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," by Nennius, and other authorities, so that there is no room to doubt its substantial truth. But the difficulty is, as to who are the Scots referred to. Notwithstanding that all our older historians, and some of our modern ones, appropriate Palladius, we have little hesitation in believing that his mission was to Ireland. In 431 there was only a small and almost unknown colony of Scots in Argyll. Hibernia was their proper seat; and it was thither the Roman legate went. It must be confessed, however, that there are strong traditions which speak of his having visited Scotland, and of having been buried at Fordoun in the Mearns. In the churchyard of that parish there are still pointed out the remains of a building, which is said to have been a chapel dedicated to the apostle, and to which pilgrimages were once made from every part of the country. Not far away there is a well, still called Paldy's well; and fountains regarded as sacred may retain a particular designation for many centuries.[1] From these circumstances we are inclined to think with Stillingfleet "that Nennius has hit upon the true account of the matter, viz., that Palladius was sent by Celestine to convert the Scots, but finding no great success therein, he was driven on the coasts of Britain, and there died; and after his death St Patrick was sent on the same errand.[2]

Scotland, Wales, and Picardy all claim St Patrick for a son. It seems certain that the great Irish apostle was no Irishman. Kilpatrick on the Clyde is thought by many antiquaries to have been the place where he first saw the light, and it is certainly curious that "Succat," a name bestowed on the saint, is also the name of a property in the district. The year 372 is given as the date of his birth, and wherever born, he is said in early youth to have been kidnapped and carried off by an Irish chief, and kept for years as a swine-herd. Recovering his liberty, he went to the south of France, and studied theology under the famous St Martin of Tours. At the age of sixty he returned to Ireland, the house of his bondage, and

---

[1] Statistical Account of Scotland. Fordoun, 1795.

[2] Antiquities of the British Churches, chap. ii. The words of Nennius are:—"During his (Patrick's, in captivity) continuance there, Palladius, the first bishop, was sent by Pope Celestine to convert the Scots. But tempests and signs from God prevented his landing, for no one can arrive in any country except it be allowed from above; altering, therefore, his course from Ireland, he came to Britain, and died in the land of the Picts." Hist. of the Britons.

preached the gospel there with such success, that he is said to have written 365 alphabets, founded 365 churches, and ordained 365 bishops, besides 3000 presbyters.[1] We may safely conclude this to be an exaggeration, but, notwithstanding the fabulous atmosphere which encompasses his life, enough of reality remains to warrant us to rank him as the first and greatest of the benefactors of Ireland. His memory must once have been deeply venerated in Scotland from the number of places which are called by his name.

We must now overleap another whole century, during which everything connected with the Christianity of Scotland is buried in gloom. We have no traces of those who succeeded Ninian and Palladius in their missionary work, and kept alive among the Picts and the Britons the faith which they had received; but we have every reason to believe that they had their successors, and that the altar-fire which they kindled was never allowed to go out. Tradition has handed down the names of St Serf and St Ternan, but nothing authentic is known regarding them. Neither have we authentic records of any others who, during this period, may have laboured in other parts of the Scottish field. After St Ninian, Columba is the next whose name has emerged from the darkness of the age in which he lived, and the still deeper darkness of the ages which succeeded. But with this celebrated saint begins the most interesting period in our ancient ecclesiastical annals.

St Columba, or Colum, is happy in having two biographers, who were both his successors in the Monastery of Iona, and lived not very far from his own day. Cumin wrote sixty-nine, and Adamnan eighty-three years after the death of Columba, a period during which the memory might easily preserve every important event connected with a celebrated man, and which gives us room to imagine that both biographers may have conversed with old men who could tell of having seen Columba

---

[1] In the text we have given the story as it is found in Dr Mackenzie's Life of St Patrick, who quotes Nennius as his authority.—Lives and Characters of the Most Eminent Writers of the Scots Nation, by Geo. Mackenzie, M.D. In Bohn's translation of Nennius, the passage stands thus:—"He wrote 365 canonical and other books relating to the faith. He founded as many churches, and consecrated the same number of bishops, strengthening them with the Holy Ghost. He ordained 3000 presbyters, and converted and baptized 12,000 persons in the province of Connaught." History of the Britons, § 54. We leave the reader to decide whether the 365 ABC's or canonical books are the more likely.

in their youth. Yet this short interval was enough to surround the life of the saint with a mythical haze, so that his biographer Adamnan professes to relate only the prophecies uttered, the miracles wrought, and the divine visions enjoyed by the holy abbot. We shall cease to wonder at this when we remember that in those dark days the power of working miracles was thought essential to the character of a saint; and probably some of these good but superstitious men, by a very natural self-deception, believed they really possessed the power, as our kings and queens once flattered themselves that their touch would cure the scrofula. It was in this very age that the Pope gravely wrote to Augustine in England not to glory too much in his miracles.[1]

Columba was born at Gartan, among the wilds of Donegal, in the north-west of Ireland, in the year 521. His father was Fedhlimid M'Fergus, and his mother Aethnea M'Nave, both of whom were of princely descent. We are told that even from his boyish years he was addicted to the study of the Holy Scriptures. He was first of all placed under the care of a pious presbyter named Cruinechan; and he afterwards obtained a fuller knowledge of Christianity from Finian, bishop of Clonfert, and the famous St Ciaran, who, it appears, had preached before this time to the Dalriad Scots in Argyll, and who has bequeathed his name to the parish of Kilkerran. About the year 550 he is said to have founded the ancient monastery of Durrow. But notwithstanding this pious act he was implicated in some of the bloody feuds of his day, and excommunicated by an Irish Council. Thus cast out as an outlaw and accursed, he left Ireland in 563, being then 42 years of age, and probably resolved to wash out the stain of blood by a life devoted to monastic and missionary work. Setting sail in an open boat of wicker-work covered with hides, and accompanied by twelve companions, he reached the Island of Iona on the evening of Whitmonday, and landed in a little pebbly bay called Port-na-Churaich, at a spot which tradition has preserved, and where an artificial mound, faintly resembling an inverted boat, is said to be fashioned after the pattern of the currach in which the saint navigated the sea.[2]

Conal MacComgail was at this time King of the Dalriad Scots, and Brude of the Picts; the former of whom gifted to Columba the island upon which he had settled his colony of

---

[1] Bede, book i. chap. xxxi.

[2] Statistical Account of Scotland—Kilfinichen and Kilviceuan, 1795.

pious men.[1] Here he founded his monastery, afterwards so famous in the history of the Church. But Columba did not confine himself to the solitary rock; he frequently visited the mainland, and appears to have acquired a considerable ascendancy over its monarchs. The Irish Scots being already Christians, it was among the Picts that he chiefly prosecuted his apostolic work. Christianity appears to have hitherto made no progress amongst them; they are described as "heathen barbarians;" and to Columba belongs the high honour of having converted them to the faith. Adamnan records a visit which the saint made to King Brude at his royal fortress near Inverness, to which he probably travelled along the romantic chain of lochs and streams by which the tourist still passes from Iona and Staffa to the banks of the Ness. Some of the incidents in the missionary enterprise illustrate the superstitions of the Picts, the character of the apostle now bent on their conversion, and the love of the miraculous in his biographer.

The king, in his idolatrous pride, and instigated thereto by his high priest Broichan, shut his gates against Columba, but the holy man touched them with his finger, making the sign of the cross, and this acting, like the talismanic *open sesame* in the Arabian tale of Ali Baba, they flew open of themselves. On another occasion, while the saint was celebrating the praises of God, some Druids coming near endeavoured to hinder him, lest the sound of the divine praise from his mouth should be heard among the pagan people; but Columba, perceiving this, began to sing the forty-fourth psalm with such energy, that his voice appeared like thunder, and filled the king and his people with intolerable fear. We are further informed, that in that district there was a fountain, the haunt of demons, in which all who washed were afflicted with some dreadful disease, so that the people from superstitious fear paid it divine reverence.[2] To this fountain Columba repaired, and the Druids expected to see him smitten with leprosy. But the Saint, having first invocated the name of Christ, washed in its waters his hands and his feet, and the demons being thus

---

[1] Pinkerton (see his Inquiry) maintains that Columba got a gift of Iona from the Picts, then in possession of the Hebrides. But Ritson and the editor of the Origines Parochiales say, the grant came from the Scotch king, and the greatest weight of authority seems to be on their side.

[2] It is possible the reference here may be to the mineral waters of Strathpeffer. It is to be noted that, as usually happens, Adamnan degrades the deities of the Picts into demons.

driven out, it was ever afterwards as famous for curing diseases as it had previously been for inflicting them.[1] By such miracles King Brude was converted to the new faith.

It is difficult at first to divine what could have led Columba to fix his monastery in Iona—a barren rock washed by a tempestuous sea. We cannot believe that he was floated thither by the random winds and waves, and that chance decided the spot whence letters and religion were afterwards to be carried over the whole country. Leaving the north of Ireland, and turning his prow a little to the east, he would naturally have touched first upon the coast of Wigton or the Mull of Cantyre. Iona is due north from Ireland, and is distant from it upwards of a hundred miles. At that period there must have been constant intercourse between the Scots of Ireland and the Scots of Argyll, and the navigation of the sea which separated them been well understood. The truth is, that though we wonder now that such a sequestered isle should be chosen for such a purpose, it was in accordance with the notions and practice of the age. Religion generally made her abode in some island off the coast, whether to give greater safety to the defenceless priests, or more perfect seclusion from the din of the world. Druidism had its chief seat in Anglesey. Christianity found its first resting-place in Iona. Lindisfarne was the earliest centre of the Northumbrian Church ; and Lismore was the ancient residence of the bishops of Argyll.

Iona, from first to last, has borne no fewer than thirty names.[2] Of these the most common are I, Iona, and Icolmkill. I is the name generally used by the natives, and signifies simply an island. Iona is probably a form of Ii-shona (pronounced I-hona) and signifies Holy Island. Icolmkill is "the island of Colum of the Cells." It is about three miles long, by a mile and a half broad. Its surface is in general low and uninteresting, rising into a few irregular heights, and its coast is indented by small rocky bays with wonderfully translucent water.[3] It is separated from the Island of Mull by a narrow strait of about a mile in width, and from the nearest point on the mainland by about thirty-six miles of water. The almost

---

[1] Adamnani Vita Columbæ. The word in the original is magi, but magi is just the Latin equivalent of the Celtic Druidhs.

[2] Origines Parochiales Scotiæ — Iona, — where the whole thirty are recorded ; many of these, however, are just different forms of the same word.

[3] Iona, by the Duke of Argyll, is an interesting monograph of the island.

1867425

incessant jumble of the sea, caused by its currents and tides being broken by numerous headlands, and lashed by squalls from the hills, must have made its navigation dangerous in open currachs in the days of Columba. In our day, the summer tourist, taking a steamboat at Oban, can glide safely and swiftly through the deep waters of the Sound of Mull; catch a glimpse of the ruined holds of the ancient Lords of the Isles, beetling on the summit of lofty crags; emerge on the bosom of the wide Atlantic; gaze with wonder on the basaltic columns and resounding caves of Staffa; and finally feel himself "treading," with Dr Johnson, "that illustrious island which was once the luminary of the Caledonian regions, whence savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion."[1]

In this island Colum built his cell.[2] It must have been a very rude structure, formed, as we know it was, of logs, and thatched with reeds; and we must not confound it with those ruins which still give a religious aspect to the island, and which belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Columba now applied himself almost entirely to the government of his little community, and the remainder of his life was mainly spent in the midst of it. The time of his companions appears to have been divided between devotion, the copying religious books, and the labours of the field; and we read with intense interest of the Saint, in his old age, going out in his car to see them at work and give them his blessing. His log-monastery was built, round a court and included a church or oratory, with an altar and recess; a *hospitium*, this being either a house for the entertainment of strangers, or the common name for the separate cells of the monks; a dwelling-house for the saint himself; and a barn for laying up the produce of the fields. The whole was surrounded by a rude rampart or fence. The recluses were called to their devotions by a bell—no doubt similar to those oblong Celtic bells still to be seen in antiquarian museums. Here for thirty-four years Columba lived and laboured, training men for missionary work; unless when he occasionally visited the mainland to found churches, or water those he had already planted. So abundant were his labours in this field that he acquired for himself the name of

---

[1] Tour to the Hebrides.

[2] We have many names of towns beginning with the syllable "Kil," which signifies that these were anciently the cells or churches of particular saints. Kilmarnock is the cell of Marnock, Kilpatrick the cell of Patrick, and so of Kilbride, Kilkerran, Kilninian, Kilblane, &c., &c.

Columkille, which signifies Colum of the Churches. On the last day of his life, and when he was now seventy-seven years of age, he was occupied copying the Psalter, and finished his earthly labours with the words of the thirty-fourth psalm —"They that seek the Lord shall not want any good thing." When the bell sounded the hour for midnight prayers, the good old man, rigid in the observance of his own rules to the last, though suffering from an illness which made him feel that his death was at hand, rose from his dormitory, hurried to the church, and prostrated himself before the altar; but the effort was too much, and he sunk to the floor. His faithful servant Diarmid, and others who had come to the church to worship like himself, were soon beside him and lifted him up, but he had only strength to raise his hand in token that he blessed them before he died. His sorrowing followers wrapped his body in clean linen, and committed it to the dust, there to rest, says his biographer, "until in luminous and eternal brightness he should be raised again."[1] His remains were allowed to rest near his monastery for a century, so that Iona may fairly claim his dust—the first of the much princely and priestly dust afterwards deposited in that most ancient of cemeteries—but his bones, or what was thought to be his bones, were afterwards carried to Ireland, and back again to Scotland; and where they now repose it is impossible to discover.

Columba must have been a very remarkable man. The influence which he obtained over the barbarous kings of the Scots and the Picts—the conversions he made, and the churches he founded—the veneration in which he was held by his followers and friends—and the virtual primacy he possessed over the Christianity of the whole country, are ample evidence of the fact. He is described by his admiring biographer as "of angelic appearance." Like some of Homer's heroes, he is celebrated for the powers of his voice, which is said to have been audible at the distance of nearly a mile. The sonorous psalm-singing of the saint would come echoing down the lonely glens like the noise of a distant waterfall. Next to strength of arm, strength of lungs appears to have been held in repute in those rude ages; and the thundering commands of the captain, the shouts of the warrior, and the declamation of the preacher, had their strong influence in

---

[1] In luminosa et æternali resurrecturum claritudine. Adamnani Vita Columbæ.

compelling obedience and generating awe. But we would wrong the memory of Columba did we imagine it was merely by dint of vociferation that he obtained his ecclesiastical supremacy. He was a man of letters; a hymn-writer; he spent a large portion of his own time in transcribing the works of the ancients, and compelled his recluses to employ themselves in the same way; and there is a general tradition that there was within the monastery of Iona a noble library, in which the learned once dreamt there might be found the lost books of Livy.[1] The profound love with which he was universally regarded proves that he must have possessed many amiable qualities; and the story of the old mare that brought milk to the monastery, coming and laying her head on his breast and weeping, a few days before his death, presents to us in a fabulous form a touching picture of the fact. But it would appear that the imperious and passionate temper which had involved him in feuds and battles in his younger years never entirely forsook him. We read of him giving chase to a robber, who escaped his wrath by rapidly pushing off in his boat from the beach, but the saint followed him till the water was up to his knees, cursing all the while, and his curses were so effective that the boat was upset in a squall.[2]

The death of Columba was not followed by the decay of his religious community. For many years Iona was the light of the western world, and sent forth men, eminent for their learning and piety, to found bishoprics, abbacies, and universities, in every quarter of Europe. Beautifully illuminated MSS., the work of their hands, can still be identified by their Celtic interlacings in many monastic and college libraries. But the monks did not enjoy that undisturbed safety and repose which we might imagine they would on their solitary rock. It is recorded that in the year 744, a number of the community perished in a violent storm. In 801 the monastery was burnt to the ground by the Norse pirates. In 806 the Vikingr again landed on the devoted island, and cruelly slaughtered sixty-eight of its inhabitants. In 985 Iona was visited by the Danes, who slew the abbot and fifteen of his monks. Hitherto these wild Norsemen, who were still worshippers of Woden,

---

[1] Gibbon, in a note to the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, alludes to this. Boethius says that Æneas Sylvius (afterwards Pope Pius II.), when in Scotland, intended to have visited the library in search of the missing decades, but was prevented. Notwithstanding the tradition, we may be permitted to doubt the extent of this library.

[2] Vit. Col. Adamnani.

burnt churches and slaughtered priests without mercy and without remorse. But they received Christianity early in the eleventh century, and in their next descent on the Hebrides we have evidence of its power. The Norse Sagas inform us that King Magnus entered their church—probably St Oran's Chapel in its original form—but immediately came out again, filled with religious awe, and gave orders that none should dare to violate its sanctity.

In the twelfth century Rome was everywhere triumphant in Scotland, and Iona passed into the possession of Cluniac monks. Its pure and primitive faith had departed; its renown for piety and learning was gone; but the memory of these survived, and it was now regarded with greater superstitious reverence than ever. Long before this it had been made the burial-place of royalty, numerous pilgrimages were made to it, and now kings and chiefs began to enrich it with donations of tithes and land. The walls which are now crumbling were then reared: and the voyager beholds these venerable ecclesiastical remains rising from a bare rock and in the midst of a wide ocean, with feelings akin to those with which he regards the temples at Thebes standing half buried amid the sands of the desert.

Contemporary with Columba was St Mungo, the patron saint of Glasgow. While there is no doubt of the existence of such a person, unfortunately his life is involved in fable. He is said to have been the son of a British chief called Ewen, and of Thaney, a daughter of Leudon, a King of the Picts. This royal lady, becoming pregnant when she ought not, was exposed on the sea in an open boat by her angry father, and carried by the wind and waves to the coast where the town of Culross now stands. Here the infant Kentigern was born. St Serf, whom tradition points out as the apostle of the Orkneys, was living in the neighbourhood, and by him the little bastard was baptized. As the child grew up, he gave early indications of piety and genius, and St Serf taking a particular liking to him, carefully initiated him in the mysteries of the faith, and being in the habit of calling him "*Mongah,*" which in the Norse tongue signifies "dear friend," from this arose the appellation of Mungo, by which the Saint is now generally known.[1]

Such is the legendary origin of St Mungo, and quite as

---

[1] Vita Kentigerni Auctore Jocelino, also Vita Kentigerni imperfecta Auctore ignoto. See Forbes' S. Ninian and S. Kentigern.

legendary are the monkish narratives of his episcopal labours and penances; as his standing in the river every morning, however cold, till he recited the whole psalter, and then emerging as pure as a milk-white dove, and sunning himself on the neighbouring hill. But under all this rubbish there must have been real worth, so that when the lofty cathedral which now crowns the metropolis of the West was reared six centuries after, so precious was the memory of his piety and toils that it was called by his name.

Columba is said to have visited Kentigern "at the place called Mellindonor," then a translucent stream, but now a filthy city sewer. The monkish biographer tells how they exchanged pastoral staffs when they parted.[1] The only incident which marred their perfect happiness was that some of the Highland caterans in the company of St Columba thus early developed their propensity to sheep-stealing, by catching and killing a ram of the southron saint; but the theft was forgiven by the amiable Mungo, and the ram's head turned into stone in memory of the event.[2] The whole of the district round Glasgow at this period, except near the river, was a forest of wood and bush-land; and the legend which represents St Mungo as "compelling the wolf of the woods to join with the deer of the hills in labouring in the yoke of his plough," may preserve a memorial not merely that these animals then abounded there, but that the Saint helped to extirpate them, by felling the forests and introducing agriculture. Many of the first missionaries in our own country undoubtedly did much to foster the peaceful labours of the field, as our modern missionaries teach the islanders of the Southern Seas to till, sow, and reap; and thus Christianity and civilization went hand in hand. There is no record of St Mungo having any successors at the Molendinar Burn till the twelfth century, when the Cathedral was founded, with its bishop and canons, its numerous altars and officiating priests. But no doubt he had his successors, though there was no historian to chronicle their life and labours.

After another century St Cuthbert can be discerned, with a saintly halo around him, amid the darkness of the Strathclyde and Northumbrian kingdoms. Originally a shepherd boy in Lauderdale, visited by dreams and visions of angels, we afterwards find him as a monk at Dull in Strathtay, next at Ripon, next at Melrose, and finally at Lindisfarne, where, about 664

---

[1] Vita Kentigerni, c. xxxix-xl.

[2] Ibid.

A.D., he became abbot. His principal field of labour was among the shielings on the Cheviot Hills and the upland moors of Northumberland. No toil wearied him, no danger appalled him.[1] And as the reward of his labours he is now honoured as the patron saint of Durham Cathedral, and of many other churches both in England and Scotland. These are the lights which glimmer in the Cimmerian darkness of this period, and the dawn was yet a long way off. But it was coming, and there were faint indications of its approach. The influence of Iona was beginning to be felt both in the north and south. Already there were churches at Abernethy, Deer, and elsewhere, which so grew in reputation that they began to rival the parent monastery; and missionaries from the wave-washed island in the Atlantic had gone to Northumberland and laid there the foundations of a new Christianity in England. But in order to understand the true character of St Columba and his successors at Iona, and in the other monasteries they founded, we must now glance at the general history of the Church, and inquire what changes it has undergone, and what institutions it has fostered since it was planted by the apostles six centuries before.

These six centuries, which are almost a total blank in the history of the Church in Scotland, teem with the most important events in the history of the Church at large. During them the apostles had lived, and laboured, and died. Jerusalem had been sacked, the temple burnt up with fire, and Judaism for ever destroyed. Gnosticism had sprung up, which, mingling the notions of the later Platonists with the doctrines of the gospel, introduced into the Church a multitude of extravagances which it required many centuries to eradicate. A long line of illustrious men had arisen as apologists and defenders of the faith. Clemens, Ignatius, and Polycarp had well illustrated the Christian life, and then heroically died the martyr's death. Tertullian had devoted his native energy, and Origen had put forth his prodigious learning, to exonerate, explain, and diffuse Christianity. The Church had passed through ten great persecutions, and emerged from the furnace purer and more powerful than ever, with her noble army of martyrs and confessors, who, under every form of torture and death, had exemplified the strength of Christian constancy. These days of weeping were succeeded by a time of rejoicing. Constantine obtained

---

[1] Bede. Vita. St Cuth. Hist. Eccles.

the imperial purple, and, by a series of edicts, recognised Christianity as the religion of the empire. Magnificent churches now began to rear themselves, and churchmen to grow ambitious, powerful, and rich. But internal troubles arose; the eternal divinity of the Son was called in question; and it required all the quenchless vigour of Athanasius, and all the imperial authority of the Council of Nice, to settle the Homoousian doctrine. Arianism was not extinguished when Pelagianism arose; and in a battle of giants, the great Austin maintained those opinions which are now embalmed as orthodox in our creeds.

The Christian worship had not existed so long without contracting many corruptions. The rite of baptism, at first so simple, now required sponsors, chrism, the sign of the cross, and a number of other superstitious observances. The bones of the martyrs began to be regarded with religious veneration, and the catacombs were ransacked to find them. As many of the Jews who were converted by the apostles still fondly clung to the temple service, and insisted on the efficacy of circumcision, so many of the converts from paganism were unable to shake off their pagan practices, or to renounce altogether their former Gods. It was thought necessary to humour them, and to assimilate in some degree the worship of Jesus to the worship of Jupiter. A multitude of fasts and feasts were introduced, some of them almost professedly in imitation of the pagan festivals, which had been abolished only in name. The splendid ritual of heathenism was borrowed, and Christian churches became the theatres of a sensuous worship. Some of the pagan temples had been converted into Christian churches; and Bacchuses, with a little change in the drapery, were worshipped as Virgins.[1] The communion-table gave place to the altar, and wax tapers shed their dim religious light through splendid edifices, adorned with statues and pictures, and odorous with incense. The consecrated bread was regarded as possessing extraordinary virtues; transubstantiation, though not defined, was virtually believed; and the host was piously elevated as an oblation by the priest in the celebration of the eucharist. Beatified saints were raised to the place of the *Dii Minores*, and solemnly invoked by the faithful. The cross, apart from the great Victim who died upon it, became the object of worship; and the supposed presence of a piece of its true wood stirred up the lowest depths of the religious nature.

---

[1] Dr Middleton's Letter from Rome.

It was within the same period that diocesan Episcopacy and Monachism took their rise; and we must premise some examination of these institutions, as they are intimately connected with the estimate we are to form of the character and history of the Columbites.

It is now agreed by almost all ecclesiastical historians, that in apostolic times the presbyter and bishop was one and the same person. The two terms are indiscriminately applied to the same persons in too many passages in the New Testament to admit of a doubt in regard to the matter. "Presbyter" appears to have been more peculiarly a term of respect, as applied to the primitive pastors; and "bishop," the name indicative of their office as superintendents of the Christian flock. The second century, however, had not run half its course before we discover traces of a distinction between them. How it at first arose we are left to conjecture;[1] but there are some circumstances which may guide us to causes not far from the truth, and which afford indubitable evidence that the distinction, narrow at first, became broad and well defined only after the lapse of ages. Originally every Christian congregation was governed by a number of *presbyterian bishops*,[2] with equal rank and authority. In process of time, expediency would suggest the propriety of one of these acting as president, to moderate the councils and execute the resolutions of the whole. An office which at first was probably temporary, subsequently became permanent, and gradually appropriated to itself the title of *bishop*; while the appellation of presbyter was left to designate those other office-bearers who had now sunk into a subordinate rank.[3] But even in the third century, every congregation had its own bishop, and very generally that congregation assembled in a private house, so that its adherents could not be very numerous, nor the power of its bishop very extensive.[4]

These congregations at first almost invariably belonged to the cities and towns; but when the tide set in more strongly in favour of Christianity, and Christian communities were

---

[1] Jerome says it arose from quarrels among the presbyters prompted by the devil. (Titus i.)

[2] Gibbon calls them "episcopal presbyters." (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. xv.)

[3] This is substantially the account of the matter given by Mosheim, Gibbon, Neander, Giesler, Baur, and every writer of any authority.

[4] Campbell's Lectures on Ecclesiastical History may be advantageously consulted on this point.

gathered in the villages, the town-bishops, unable to superintend them themselves, appointed suffragans to take the spiritual oversight in their stead, and these were called *chorepiscopi*, or country-bishops. This was the first great step to diocesan episcopacy; for the country-bishops were dependent on their grander brethren in the towns; and when they were abolished and presbyters substituted in their place, we have the subordination of the presbyters to the bishop, which modern episcopacy implies.[1] The bishops now appropriated to themselves some of the most solemn functions of the ministerial office. They alone could consecrate the baptismal chrism; they alone could confirm; they alone could convey, by the imposition of their hands, the mystic virtue necessary to constitute the apostolic priest. All this, however, was not brought about without a struggle and without time; and the memory of the original parity of the offices long remained in the churches. Even in the beginning of the fifth century, Chrysostom and Jerome could assert the primitive equality, or rather identity, of the bishop and presbyter.[2]

The same causes which raised the bishop above the presbyter, in process of time elevated the metropolitan bishop above his compeers in the provinces; and led the bishop of Rome to aspire at the establishment of a monarchy in the Church. The dominating greatness of the imperial city, and the wealth which flowed in upon the Roman Church, when it basked in the sunshine of imperial favour, gave ground upon which to rear such a lofty ambition. During the fourth and fifth centuries, the bishops of Rome were earnestly straining at this; encouraging the provincials, when they imagined themselves wronged, to appeal the case for the decision of the Roman See, asserting, though at first in moderate terms, their ecclesiastical supremacy as the successors of Peter; and by a dexterous policy they so managed it, that in the seventh century, when Christianity was just beginning to make progress in Scotland, their victory was almost complete.

The rise and progress of *monachism* had an equally important influence on the destinies of the Church. The ascetic spirit, of which monachism was but a development, is peculiar to no age or religion. It was exemplified in the

---

[1] Mosheim. Century I. Neander, vol. iii. sect. 2, Bohn's Edition. It was the councils of Sardica and Laodicea that abolished the rural bishops.

[2] Chrysostom, hom. xi., on Timothy, at the beginning. Jerome, in his commentary on the Epistle of Titus, and Ep. 101 ad Evangelium.

Essenes of Palestine before the advent of our Saviour, and it is to be seen in the devotees of Hinduism in our own day. Under the Christian system Egypt became its fruitful birthplace. Stimulated by the example and renown of Paul and Anthony, many thousands of men and women flocked to the deserts of Thebes and the islands of the Nile, that, away from the world, they might soar to the higher regions of the spiritual life. The monastic institution, though a plant peculiarly suited to the climate of the East, was transplanted to the West, where it speedily took root, and made most vigorous growths. Monasteries were reared on the banks of the Tiber; caves found for hermits by the lake of Subiaco;[1] and Martin of Tours, who from a soldier became a hermit, was followed to his grave by two thousand monkish mourners. All the learning and eloquence of the day were exhausted in eulogies on the anchorite life. Athanasius first introduced Egyptian monks into Rome. Chrysostom opened his golden mouth in their praise. Jerome gave to the institution the weight of his own example; and even Augustine was so completely carried away with the spirit of the time, that he wrote treatises in its defence and commendation.

It is impossible to doubt but that monachism in its first origin contained much that was good. Many pure spirits fled to the cloister really to escape the contagion of the world. Many enthusiastic spirits fled thither, sincerely believing they might there cultivate a sublimer piety. The extravagances of the East were little known or practised in the West, and the rule of St Benedict, who lived in the sixth century, and to which almost all the monasteries of Italy and Gaul submitted, is dictated in a liberal spirit, considering the age in which he lived. Under this rule excessive mortifications were avoided; no limited quantity of food was prescribed; and even a little wine, out of consideration to human frailty, was allowed. The monks were not suffered to be idle; they were to devote their time to devotion, to reading, to the education of youth, to the labours of the field, or some useful handicraft. Accordingly, we will not wonder that many eminent bishops emanated from these Benedictine schools; and that enthusiastic men left cloisters, where sober sense was mingled with superstition, to carry the torch of truth among idolatrous nations, and proved most useful and successful missionaries.

---

[1] It was by this lake that Benedict had his first cell, and near him was the grotto of another monk named Romanus.

At first these monks were all laymen, and belonged to no ecclesiastical denomination. They were simply people who had bound themselves by a vow to renounce the world, to live in poverty and chastity, and to devote their time to prayer, penance, meditation, and industrial toils. The monastic life was open to the laity of all conditions and of both sexes; and the sanctity of the cloister was frequently abused by the slave fleeing thither to escape from his master, and the legionary to avoid the rigours of discipline and the dangers of the field. But it was impossible to debar the monks for ever from ecclesiastical offices and emoluments. In the very earliest times we frequently read of some holy hermit reluctantly brought from his cell and placed on the bishop's throne, amid the applauses of the people; and eventually, by the policy of the popes, the whole body was constituted into a regular ecclesiastical order, which ever afterwards successfully competed with the Seculars for the honours of the Church and the veneration of the populace. It is needless at present to trace the progress of monachism farther. It was not long before the original nature of the institution was forgotten, and vices of the most odious kind crept into the cloister.

Such were some of the changes which early Christianity underwent, and some of the institutions which sprung up in the Church. It would, however, be a violation of all historic probability to suppose that they simultaneously affected every portion of Christendom. It would be absurd to liken them to the enactments of a legislature, carried into execution in every part of the kingdom on a fixed day. They were rather customs, which generally require ages to mature, and ages more to spread. Taking their rise in particular centres, they slowly extended themselves towards the extremities.[1] Emanating from Alexandria[2] or Rome, it was only by degrees they were known and adopted in the distant provinces. In those countries between which there was a constant intercourse, the contagion of the new example would be proportionally rapid: in those which were cut off from the rest of the world, it would

---

[1] This is substantially the view which has been taken by Bishop Lightfoot:—"They show that this creation (that of the Episcopate) was not so much an isolated act as a progressive development, not advancing everywhere at a uniform rate, but exhibiting at one and the same time different stages of growth in different churches." Epis. to Philippians. Essay on Ministry, p. 225.

[2] It is, however, curious that relics of Presbyterianism lingered in Alexandria till the fourth century. Hieron, Ep. 146, Ad. Evan.

be proportionally slow. The churches which lay along the shores of the Mediterranean quickly felt every important impulse, heard the news of every fresh heresy that was broached, and had amongst them imitators of every innovating practice that was introduced; while the religious communities that were buried in the woods of Germany, or lost in the marshes of Caledonia, might be unconscious of the changes that were going on in the great world for centuries after.

Before the first century was expired, Christianity was preached along the whole northern coast of Africa, and the southern coast of Europe; it required nearly two centuries more to come to our country, and other three centuries still before it was generally embraced. During the greater part of this period, the Roman empire extended to our island, and thus an intercourse was kept up between it and the Continent, but that intercourse almost entirely ceased when the legions were withdrawn. "The dark cloud," says Gibbon, in his own eloquent way, "which had been cleared by the Phœnician discoverers, and finally dispelled by the arms of Cæsar, again settled on the shores of the Atlantic, and a Roman province was again lost among the fabulous islands of the ocean." [1]

When our country was thus lost to the civilized world, and its rude population shut out from all intercourse with the centres of Christian influence, we shall not wonder that the wave of innovation, which surged so rapidly along the Mediterranean, took centuries before it broke upon our shore. The impassable gulph between the presbyter and the bishop might, and in fact must have been, fixed in Italy for many long years before it was known and believed in here. The monasteries of Europe and the East might have become hot-beds of superstition and vice, and yet a pure monachism, once introduced into Scotland, might there be preserved. While the marble churches of Constantinople and Rome were perfumed with incense, and adorned with images, incense and images might be alike unknown in the log churches of Caledonia. Even when the Scottish clergy learned the new ideas that were abroad, they might decline to adopt them. It is ever difficult to carry new fashions from one country to another, more especially when there is little or no intercourse between them; and all the weight of legislation sometimes fails to abolish a custom to which the people have become attached.

These remarks may elucidate the controversies which have

---

[1] Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chap. xxxix.

been waged in regard to Columba and the Columbites. A question has been raised as to whether they were monks. They undoubtely were. The life and institutions of Columba and his successors abundantly attest this. But they might be monks without having contracted the vices of monaachism. Having embraced the system in its purity, they might preserve it pure in Icolumkille, Abernethy, and Dunkeld, when it had become utterly corrupt in the great monasteries of the Continent.

There is good reason to believe that it was so; and that in Scotland, far removed from Roman influences, there was a form of monachism, with little of its usual austerity and few of its prevalent vices. The monastery at Iona appears to have been little different from a college, in which men were trained for missionary work; and as occasion required, they left its quiet cloisters for the active duties of life. That Columba had entirely escaped those superstitious notions which had arisen in Italy and the East long before his day it were foolish to suppose, and his biographies will not allow us to believe. The rules by which he governed his community; the scrupulosity with which he repaired to the church at all hours of the day and night to perform his devotions; his preference for celibacy, if not his entire prohibition of marriage, are not in accordance with Protestant ideas of what is scriptural and right. The love of the miraculous so conspicuous in his biographers, shows that this fond deception had as deeply tainted the disciples of Columba as the disciples of Benedict.

In what school he acquired his monastic notions it is impossible to determine; but we know that of all ecclesiastical institutions monachism spread the most rapidly, and that a hundred years sufficed to carry it from the extreme east to the extreme west of Christendom. Both St Ninian and St Patrick are said to have been related to St Martin; and as we find it difficult to believe that the Bishop of Tours had such an extensive Scotch connection by matrimony or blood, we resort to the supposition that the relation arose from their having borrowed his ideas of the Christian life. As the monachism of the East was *toned down* to suit the different men, manners, and climate of the West, so the monachism of France would naturally undergo a still further modification to suit the rude, half-Christianised population of Ireland and the Hebrides. The exotic from Egypt took root in Iona; but with a thin soil, and under a northern sky, it never showed the same

prurient luxuriance of fruit or of foliage as in warmer and more southern lands.

The ecclesiastical polity of Columba and the Columbites has also been a matter of dispute, and a passage in Bede has brought the Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches into collision. "That island" (Iona), says the venerable historian, "has for its ruler an abbot, who is a presbyter, to whose direction all the province, and even the bishops, contrary to the usual method, are subject, according to the example of their first teacher, who was not a bishop, but a presbyter and monk."[1] That bishops should be subject to a presbyter or mass-priest, as the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" styles Columba,[2] is abhorrent to every idea of episcopal propriety, and accordingly the candid simplicity of Bede has caused much confusion in the episcopal camp.

It was indeed unusual in the sixth and seventh centuries for bishops to be under the jurisdiction of a presbyter; and yet we need not greatly wonder that such a thing should have occurred in a province so far removed from ecclesiastical influence as Scotland then was. Though the bishop began to rise above the presbyter in the second century, many generations lived and died before the difference between them was well defined, and even in the fifth century writers referred to their original and essential identity. In all probability, Christianity was introduced into Ireland—whence it was brought to Scotland—before the great gulph was fixed between the two orders;[3] and if such an ecclesiastical polity was brought to the country, it might continue there unchanged for centuries, uninfluenced by the great changes which were going on from without. Even in our own day, notwithstanding the ease and rapidity of transit, and that men are everywhere passing to and fro, and increasing knowledge, some districts of the Highlands are almost inaccessible to the ideas and influences of the

---

[1] Ecclesiastical History, book iii., chap. iv.

[2] "A.D. 565. Columba, a mass-priest, came to the Picts and converted them to the faith of Christ; they are dwellers by the northern mountains. . . . . Now, in Iona, there must ever be an abbot, and not a bishop; and all the Scottish bishops ought to be subject to him, because Columba was an abbot and not a bishop." (Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.)

[3] Nennius says St Patrick ordained 365 bishops in Ireland. These must simply have been ministers or Christian workers. In the Episcopal Church of Ireland, at present, there are only 12 prelates.

south. The very poverty of the country would help to keep the bishop on a par with the presbyter, for it is only in opulent kingdoms, and where the Church is supported by the State, that Episcopacy has obtained its fullest development.

The fact, as narrated by Bede, though perhaps unusual, was perfectly natural and likely in the circumstances. Iona was a monastic seminary for training men for the work of the ministry. As opportunity presented, they left their retirement, and took the oversight of Christian flocks, thereby becoming virtually bishops. That such men should differentially look to the abbot, under whom they had been reared, for advice and direction was very natural; and thus a kind of primacy would arise, and that more readily from the respect assigned to monks in those days, and the fact that the monastery of Iona was the parent of so many of the churches of Scotland.[1]

CHAPTER IV.

In the year 597 Augustine arrived in the island of Thanet, off the coast of Kent, with a train of some forty monks. The story of the incident which led to his mission, if not true, is at least interesting. Gregory, before his elevation to the pontificate, had observed some youths in the Roman slave-market, of a complexion fairer than common; and inquiring of what nation they came, was told they were Angles. "Not Angles, but Angels," he replied, "if they were only Christianized."[2]

---

[1] Dr Grub candidly and fully admits that the early ecclesiastical government of Scotland was abbatial and presbyterian, and not episcopal. Vol. i. p. 134-43.

[2] Bede's Ecclesiastical History, book ii. chap. i. The Pope appears to have been an inveterate punster. The whole story as told by Bede is as follows :—" 'Alas! what pity,' said he, 'that the author of *darkness* is possessed of men of such *fair* countenances; and that being remarkable for such *graceful* aspects, their minds should be void of inward *grace*.' He therefore again asked what was the name of that nation? and was answered that they were called *Angles*. 'Right,' said he, 'for they have an *angelic* face, and it becomes such to be co-heirs with the *angels* in Heaven. What is the name,' proceeded he, 'of the province from which they are brought?' It was replied, that the natives of that province were called *Deiri*. 'Truly are they *De ira*,' said he, 'withdrawn from wrath and called to the mercy of Christ. How is the king of that province called?' They told him his name was *Ælla*; and he, alluding to the name, said, '*Hallelujah*, the praise of God the Creator must be sung in those parts.'" We have helped the pontificial wit by italics; and we may remark that the puns are nearly as pointed in the English translation as in the Latin of Bede.

When raised to the chair of St Peter, he remembered the nation of the captive youths, and sent Augustine to convert them. For nearly a hundred years from the time we speak of, the Anglo-Saxons, incessantly recruited by new swarms of adventurers, had been gradually gaining upon the Britons; and now they had driven the miserable remnants of that people into the mountain fastnesses of Wales. With the British people had well-nigh perished the British Church. The Saxon invaders were heathens, worshippers of Woden and Thor; and now for the second time must the people of England be converted to the Christian faith.

Augustine managed to ingratiate himself with Ethelbert, King of Kent, and obtained permission to establish himself in the royal city of Canterbury. The work of conversion prospered in his hands, and in due time the Roman bishop constituted him primate of England, sent him the pall, and with it certain Roman wares, coverings for the altars, ornaments for the churches, vestments for the priests, and relics of the holy apostles and martyrs.[1] On inquiring a little more narrowly into the religious state of the kingdom, the new Archbishop discovered that the clergy of the British Church who still survived did not keep Easter at the proper time, administered baptism without the consecrated chrism, and in other respects violated the unity of the faith. He therefore held a conference with their bishops and doctors to persuade them to conformity, and when his arguments failed, he wrought a miracle to convince them, and when his miracle had no more influence than his arguments, he uttered some enigmatical words, to the effect that if they would not hold communion with their friends, they would bring down upon themselves the vengeance of their enemies. Soon after this threat, or prophecy, as we may choose to understand it, the King of Northumbria marched upon Chester, made a great slaughter of the Britons, and mercilessly massacred many hundreds of monks who had come from Bangor to pray for their countrymen. "About twelve hundred," says Bede, "that came to pray are reported to have been killed, and only fifty to have escaped by flight."[2] It was the first act passed against non-conformists in England.

Meantime, a succession of learned and pious abbots ruled in the monastery of Iona; and missionaries began to issue

---

[1] Bede's Ecclesiastical History, book i. chap. xxix.

[2] Ibid., book ii. chap. ii.

from its cloisters, to carry the light of Christianity not merely to Scotland, but to England and some of the countries of the Continent. There is good reason to believe that a close connection was kept up between Iona and Ireland, and that the religious colony still depended in a great measure on the parent country for a supply of students and recluses. The populations of Ireland and the north-west of Scotland were in fact identical at this time, and were known by the general appellation of Scots, so that it is often impossible to determine to which of them historical facts are to be referred. Columba was succeeded by Baithné, one of the twelve who accompanied him from Ireland. After him followed Laisren, Fergna, and Segenius. While Segenius was abbot, Oswald, King of Northumberland, who had been recently baptized in Scotland, sent to the monastery a request that preachers should be sent to instruct his subjects in the faith. The story of this mission is told by Bede, and we shall therefore follow his narrative: it belongs to the year 635.

The first Celtic apostle who went to Northumberland was a man of an austere disposition, and making no progress in converting the people, he returned to his monastery, and reported that the task was hopeless, as the Northumbrians were uncivilized men, and of a stubborn and barbarous disposition. What was to be done was now seriously debated, when an aged monk named Aidan rose up and said, addressing himself to the brother who had abandoned the missionary field,—"I am of opinion, brother, that you were more severe to your unlearned hearers than you ought to have been, and did not at first, conformably to the apostolic rule, give them the milk of more easy doctrine, till being by degrees nourished with the Word of God, they should be capable of greater perfection, and be able to practise God's sublimer precepts." A speech so sensible at once pointed out Aidan as the fittest person to deal with the barbarous Saxons, and though said to have been well-nigh eighty years of age, he undertook the task with cheerfulness and alacrity. He was accordingly ordained a bishop by the presbyter monks of Iona, and set his face toward Northumberland.[1]

Off the coast of Northumberland there is an island called Lindisfarne, or Holy Isle. It is about two miles long, and one broad. From its eastern side the German ocean stretches farther than the eye can reach; and from the western shore

---

[1] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. v.

you gaze, over a narrow channel, upon the cultivated coasts of England; and can easily discern towards the north the ancient town of Berwick; and away to the south, Bamborough Castle, crowning a bold promontory, which juts into the sea. On this island, which perhaps might remind him of Iona, Aidan determined to settle.

The aged monk at once began his apostolic work, and in this he was powerfully assisted by the king. As Aidan was not well skilled in the English tongue, his Majesty frequently condescended to act as interpreter, being well acquainted with the Scottish speech. The united piety of the monarch and the monk were not, as we may well believe, without their reward, and conversions became numerous. "From that time," says our venerable authority, "many of the Scots came daily into Britain, and with great devotion preached the Word to those provinces of the English over which King Oswald reigned; and those among them that had received priests' orders administered to them the grace of baptism. Churches were built in several places; the people joyfully flocked together to hear the Word; money and lands were given of the king's bounty to build monasteries; the English, great and small, were by their Scottish masters instructed in the rules and observances of regular discipline; for most of them that came to preach were monks."[1]

Aidan is celebrated by the Saxon historian as a perfect model of apostolic and episcopal purity. He was abstemious, continent, generous to the poor, humble to all. Austere in his own conduct, he was indulgent to others. He was wont to traverse the town and country on foot, and invite every passer-by to embrace the faith. All in his company, whether "shaven monks or laymen," were kept diligently employed in reading the Scriptures and learning psalms. If he went to dine with the king, he took two clerks with him, and having snatched a frugal repast, he made haste to be gone with them, either to read or write. Many pious men and women, led by his example, began to fast upon Wednesday and Friday till the ninth hour. There was only one spot on this otherwise spotless character—he did not keep Easter on the canonical day.

After sixteen years of diligent labour, Aidan died, and was

---

[1] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. iii. This passage proves that many of the monks that came into England had not priests' orders—in other words, were not presbyters; yet they preached. The presbyters administered the sacraments.

buried in Lindisfarne. He was succeeded by Finan, who had likewise been reared among the monks of Iona. In his lifetime, Peada, prince of the Mercians, sought in marriage Elfleda, daughter of Oswy, King of Northumberland. His reception of Christianity was made the condition of the nuptials, and the prince willingly received the faith and his bride together. He was baptized, with all his retinue, by Finan, and four priests were despatched into his kingdom to convert his subjects. Meeting with great success, Diuma, one of the four, was ordained bishop of the province.[1] But the missionary success of Finan did not end here. The East Saxons had for a short time professed Christianity, and then relapsed into idolatry. Their king at this time was Sigebert, who came to visit Oswy in Northumberland, and while there was persuaded to receive the rite of baptism. Returning home, he invited Christian teachers into his kingdom, and two were accordingly sent him. One of these, after a time, returning to Lindisfarne, and relating to Finan how successful he had been, was ordained bishop of the East Angles; and, going back to his province with more ample authority, he built churches, and ordained presbyters and deacons to assist him in "the work of faith and ministry of baptising."[2] Thus were the three great Saxon kingdoms of Northumberland, Mercia, and Essex, constituting by far the largest and most important part of England, converted to Christianity by the preaching of monks from Iona.[3] The spiritual conquerors of the country became its occupants, and for several successions the Sees of York, Durham, Lichfield, and London, were filled by Scotsmen.[4]

The transactions of these missionary monks have given rise

---

[1] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. xxi.

[2] Ibid., book iii. chap. xxii.

[3] "By the ministery of Aidan was the kingdome of Northumberland recovered from paganisme (whereunto belonged then, beside the shire of Northumberlande, and the lands beyond it unto Edenborrow, Frith, Cumberland also, and Westmorland, Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the Bishopricke of Durham); and by the means of Finan, not onely the kingdom of the East Saxons (which contained Essex, Middlesex, and halfe of Hertfordshire) regained, but also the large kingdom of Mercia converted first unto Christianity; which comprehended under it, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Leicestershire, Rutlandshire, Northamptonshire, Lincolneshire, Huntingdonshire, Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Shropshire, Nottinghamshire, Chesshire, and the other halfe of Hertfordshire." (Archbishop Usher: Religion professed by the Ancient Irish, chap. x.)

[4] Of course it will not be understood by this that these Sees, precisely as now constituted, then existed.

to a controversy regarding their ecclesiastical polity. The controversy is principally founded on the narrative of Bede, both parties referring to the language which he uses. Let us briefly advert to it.

King Oswald having asked a bishop from the Scots to administer the word of faith to him and his nation, the inmates of Iona, after hearing the discreet sentiments of Aidan, previously quoted, "concluded that he deserved to be made a bishop, and ought to be sent to instruct the unbelieving and unlearned, since he was found to be endued with singular discretion, which is the mother of other virtues, and accordingly having ordained, they sent him to their friend, King Oswald, to preach."[1] . This language, we think, evidently implies, if it does not expressly affirm, that those who judged Aidan worthy of the episcopate, both ordained and sent him. If the statement of Bede is to be held authoritative, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that it was the Presbyter-abbot of Iona and his fellow monks who consecrated the first Bishop of Landisfarne. There is no mention of a bishop being present, or taking part in the proceedings; it was the old apostolic ordination, by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Finan and Colman were ordained in the same way and by the same men; and as *they* ordained many others to be bishops, presbyters, and deacons, it is almost demonstrable that the present English Episcopate may be traced back to a Presbyterian source.

But it has been said there were bishops in Ireland and also in Scotland at the time we speak of, and that therefore there might have been one kept at Iona for the purpose of perpetuating pure episcopacy, though both Adamnan and Cumin are silent on the subject. There undoubtedly were bishops in Scotland, but they were such bishops as acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Presbyter-abbot of Iona. Reared under his care, and appointed by him to the episcopate of their respective congregations, they never dreamt that they belonged to an order higher than their abbot, or that they possessed powers of transmitting the apostolic virtue and the sacerdotal character which were denied to him.[2] In regard

---

[1] Bede's Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. v.

[2] The two passages in Adamnan's Life of Columba, which are relied upon to prove the recognition of special episcopal grace by Columba, appear to me to prove the contrary, for the Saint cursed the episcopal ordination of Aid as "a son of perdition," and in the other case Columba simply asked the stranger bishop to dispense the communion, as any presbyter might at the present day. (See Adamnan, b. i., c. 27 and c. 35.)

to Aidan and Finan, it is more than probable that they were lay-monks, previous to their being ordained as missionary-bishops to Northumberland. If they were presbyters already (for the appellation of bishop appears to have been given specially and properly to those who had the *superintendence* of a flock), then we must look for the explanation of the proceedings at Iona to that instructive passage in the Acts of the Apostles, in which we are told that as the prophets and teachers in the Church of Antioch "ministered to the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away."[1] We must be content to remain in ignorance as to whether the Scotch and Irish monks were aware of the distinction which had sprung up in the Church between the presbyter and bishop; it is probable they were, but that they were ignorant of the great and growing distance which now separated them in the south and east; or, if they did know the fact that peculiar honours and functions were now reserved for the one and denied to the other, it is plain they had determined to ignore it.

Christianity had entered Saxon-England at its two extremities. Augustine and his monks had landed in Kent, and extended their teaching and influence over the south and south-west of the kingdom. Aidan and his monks had entered Northumberland, and pushed their teaching and influence over the northern, eastern, and midland provinces. Rome and Iona met on English ground and contended for the mastery. There were not wanting subjects of dispute, for there were obvious differences between the Italian and Celtic missionaries. But the true day for the celebration of Easter, and the true form of the clerical tonsure, were the topics which excited the fiercest controversies, and stirred up the strongest passions, and ultimately led to the exodus from England of the northern ecclesiastics.

It has been supposed by some ecclesiastical writers that the British and Irish Churches agreed with the Churches of Asia in regard to the celebration of Easter, and this has been held as a proof of their Oriental origin. This, however, is plainly a mistake. Prior to the Council of Nice, the Asiatic Churches celebrated Pasch on the fourteenth day of the moon, week-day or Sunday; the British and Irish Churches never did so, but

---

[1] The Acts of the Apostles, chap. xiii. ver. 2, 3.

with the whole west kept the feast on the Sunday immediately following. Their disagreement with Rome simply arose from the adherence to an old almanac, when a new one had come into use.

The difference is easily explained. The Romans kept Easter betwixt the fifteenth and twenty-first day of the moon, immediately after the 21st day of March or vernal equinox, when the days and nights are equal. In reckoning the age of the moon they followed the Alexandrian cycle of nineteen years, or the Golden Number, as interpreted and explained by Dionysius Exiguus. The ancient British and Irish Churches, on the other hand, kept Easter on the Sunday that fell betwixt the fourteenth and twentieth day of the moon; and followed in their computation of it, not the nineteen years cycle of Anatolius, but a cycle of eighty-four years attributed to Sulpicius Verus.[1]

We have already seen the pains taken by Augustine to convince the British bishops of their error, and of their ill-fated persistency in it. Laurentius, his successor in the See of Canterbury, not only pursued the same course at home, but wrote a letter to "his most dear brothers the lords-bishops and abbots throughout all Scotland," stating, that he had expected they would have been better informed about Easter than the Britons, but that he had discovered his mistake, and that a certain Scotch bishop called Dagan had carried matters so high as to refuse to eat with him, or enter the house where he was.[2] About thirty years after this, Popes Honorius and John IV. both wrote to the Scots, earnestly exhorting them "not to think their small number, placed in the utmost borders of the earth, wiser than all the ancient and modern churches of Christ throughout all the world; and not to celebrate a different Easter, contrary to the Paschal calculation, and the synodical decrees of all the bishops upon earth."[3]

Notwithstanding these efforts of Rome and her emissaries, the good bishop Aidan appears to have escaped all serious annoyance from the Easter controversy, as Roman influence

---

[1] Usher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, chap. ix.

[2] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book ii. chap. iv.

[3] Ibid., book ii. chap. xix. In both these letters we must understand "Scots" to apply to the Scots of Ireland as well as to the Scots in the west of Scotland—in fact, to all who spoke the same Erse language. That they include the Scots settled in Argyll is proved by the circumstance that Segenus (Segenius), the Abbot of Iona, is mentioned by name in the pontifical letter.

was still but little known in Northumbria; only the historian mourns that so good a man should have cherished so grievous an error, but charitably imputes it to his rustic simplicity.[1] His successor Finan did not thus easily escape. The Queen Eanfleda had been brought up in Kent, and had with her a Kentish priest, who followed the new style in the celebration of Easter; and thus it happened, awkwardly enough, in the palace, that when the king had ended the time of fasting, and kept his Easter, the queen and her followers were still fasting and celebrating Palm Sunday.[2] But Finan stood firm, notwithstanding these courtly influences, and died in the faith in which he had been educated.

He was succeeded at Lindisfarne by Colman, who had also been reared in Iona. In his time the controversy, which had gradually been growing, came to a head. Agilbert, bishop of the West Saxons, came on a visit to the Prince of Northumberland, and advantage was taken of this to hold a synod in the monastery of Streoneshalch, which overlooked the German Sea from the cliffs of Whitby.[3] Thither, accordingly, came King Oswy and his son; Bishop Colman, with his Scottish clerks; Bishop Agilbert, with the priests Agatho and Wilfred; the queen's confessor, who sympathized with the Romanists; and the Abbess Hilda, one of the most remarkable religious women of the time, who took the side of the Scots. Bishop Ced acted as interpreter, and maintained an impartial neutrality.

The king opened the controversy with a prudent speech, in which he counselled unity and peace. Colman then declared that the tradition of his elders, which he followed, had descended from St John, the disciple beloved of the Lord. Wilfred insinuated that if St John taught any such doctrine he Judaized, and that St Peter had taught them differently. Colman pointed to St Columba, whose piety had been attested by his

---

[1] "As Christians they knew that the resurrection of our Lord, which happened on the first day after the Sabbath, was always to be celebrated on the first day after the Sabbath; but being rude barbarians, they had not learned when that first day after the Sabbath, which is now called the Lord's Day, should come." "These things I much love and admire in the aforesaid bishop, because I do not doubt they were pleasing to God; but I do not praise or approve his not observing Easter at the proper time, either through ignorance of the canonical time appointed, or, if he knew it, being prevailed on by the authority of his nation not to follow the same." (Bede, Eccles. Hist., book iii. chapters iv. and xvii.)

[2] Bede, Eccles. Hist., book iii. chap. xxv.

[3] This synod is known in history as the Synodus Pharensis.

miracles. Wilfred scornfully replied that the Lord would say to many who boasted of having prophesied and having cast out devils and done wonderful works, I never knew you. But charitably hoping it might not be so, continued Wilfred, Is Columba to be compared to the most blessed prince of the apostles to whom our Lord entrusted the keys of the kingdom of heaven? This decided the controversy. Is it true, cried the king, that St Peter keeps the keys? This both the disputants were obliged to confess, while no such high office could be claimed for Columba. Then, said the king, I must obey his decree, lest when I come to the gates there should be none to open.

But this was not the only question which inflamed ecclesiastics, and disturbed the peace and unity of the Church. There was a controversy regarding the tonsure, which ran as high as that regarding Easter, and the proper method of shaving the crown of the head was invested with all the solemnity of religion. The tonsure appears to have originated among the earliest Christian ascetics, and to have been used by them as a distinctive token of their renunciation of the world. Towards the close of the fifth century, it began to be regarded, both in the east and west, as a necessary mark of the sacerdotal caste; and now the barber's razor was required to co-operate with the bishop's hand to constitute the priest. Two modes of shaving the clerical crown—the circular and semicircular—came into use; but who were the inventors of them, History, with blameworthy carelessness, has neglected to record. The Roman clergy gave a preference to the circular shave, which was and is performed by making bald a small round spot on the very crown of the head, and leaving it encircled by hair. The Scottish monks, on the other hand, adopted the semicircular mode, and shaved the forepart of their head from ear to ear, in the form of a crescent.

Augustine and his successors in the See of Canterbury were much shocked at the barbarism of the Scottish clergy, called their way of shaving the tonsure of Simon Magus, and insisted that henceforward they should perform the operation after the Roman fashion. So far did matters proceed that the tonsure was made a test of orthodoxy, and a man was or was not a heretic according as he made bare the crown or the forepart of his head. Discourses were preached, and arguments held, to extol the one method and reprobate the other; and even texts of Scripture were quoted as decisive in favour of the

circular mode. The horror with which the Italian clergy affected to behold the crescent crowns of the monks of Iona is inadequately represented by the feeling with which the gentleman, fresh from the capital, contemplates the uncouthly-shorn locks of the rustic. But neither eloquence, arguments, nor derision had any effect upon the presbyters of the north. They steadfastly maintained that theirs was the better way, and that they would continue to shave their heads as St John and St Polycarp had done before them.

The adverse decision in the Easter controversy, and the continual taunts to which he was exposed on account of the shape of his tonsure, determined Colman to leave Lindisfarne, and return to Iona.[1] He was accompanied by all who were of the same mind as himself, and they devoutly carried away with them part of the bones of the most reverend Father Aidan. Thus Italian priests and practices prevailed in England, and drove out the Scots after an occupation of thirty years. Neander laments the unfortunate decision of the disputation at Streoneshalch, and remarks, "that the manner in which it was made could not fail to be attended with the most important effects on the shaping of ecclesiastical relations all over England; for had the Scottish tendency prevailed, England would have obtained a more free Church constitution, and a reaction against the Romish hierarchical system would have ever continued to go forth from this quarter.[2] Mr Green, on the other hand, thinks that if the influence of Iona had triumphed, England would have been isolated from the civilisation, the letters, and the laws of Continental Christendom.[3] The victory of Whitby being achieved, Northumberland did not prove the limit of Roman influence. Parts of our country inaccessible to Roman soldiers were subdued by Roman priests, and in the course of another century all the monks of Scotland shaved their heads in the orthodox fashion, and observed Easter on the orthodox day. Nectan, King of the Picts, was the first to yield, and he was followed soon afterwards by the community of Iona.[4]

It has been thought by some historians, that in the firmness with which the Celtic monks defended their own tonsure and their own Easter we see something of the Protestant spirit,

[1] Bede, Eccles. Hist., book iii. chap. xxvi.

[2] Church History, vol. v. sect. i.

[3] History of the English People, book i. p 57.

[4] Bede, book iv.

and that even in these foolish monkish disputes we may trace the indications of a purer faith than generally prevailed at the time. To this it has been replied, that the Celts shaved their crowns and kept their Easter as scrupulously as the Romans, though in the one case they preferred the semicircular to the circular tonsure, and in the other an old calendar to a new one; and that the difference arose solely from their being further removed from Romish influences, and therefore a century or two later of being affected by them. It has been said that we may see an illustration of the whole matter in the tenacity with which the rural districts of Scotland keep to the Old Style in counting their terms, so long after the cities and towns have adopted the New; and it has been somewhat unfairly insinuated, that a Highland minister, in our own day, would feel as reluctant to allow his hair to be trimmed after the Parisian mode, as his Columbite predecessor, twelve hundred years ago, was to allow his head to be shaved after the fashion of the friseurs of Rome. Repudiating the illustration, we may allow the argument, for it goes to prove that in Scotland, at this time, there was a more primitive, and therefore in all probability a purer faith, than in Italy or Gaul. In the Church of Scotland in the sixth and seventh centuries, we see the Church of Rome in the third and fourth. By reason of its isolation, it was behind the age; but that very circumstance brought it nearer to the age of the apostles. This one thing we may clearly learn from the controversy at Streoneshalch, that the monks of Iona did not acknowledge that they owed any allegiance to the Bishop of Rome. They learned that lesson afterwards, but it was not yet.

Some writers have attempted to prove that the Columbites repudiated auricular confession, the worship of saints and images, the doctrine of purgatory, and the real presence in the Sacrament of the Supper; and have delighted to portray them as free from almost all the errors and superstitions of the Roman Church, the holy children in the midst of Babylon.[1] An impartial examination of their history shows this to be a fond delusion. It is certain they were always behind the Roman clergy in the reception of new doctrines and modes of worship; and that the Romish ritual never attained its full splendour amongst them; but this is to be attributed solely to

---

[1] Dr Jamieson and others. See Historical Account of the Ancient Culdees, pp. 198-220. This history, however, is full of interesting and erudite information.

the remoteness of their situation, the simplicity of their manners, and the poverty of their country. But they gloried in their miracles;[1] they paid respect to relics;[2] they had their monasteries, their abbots, and their abbesses, and lived according to a monastic discipline; they performed penances, fasted on Wednesdays and Fridays,[3] ascribed virtue to the sign of the cross, used a liturgy, believed in the intercession of saints,[4] had something very like to auricular confession, absolution,[5] and masses for the dead.[6] But who will doubt but that very many of them were good and holy men, notwithstanding they were so far infected by the superstitions of their time.

Though the early Celtic monks had caught the contagion of many of those errors which are now denominated Roman, we would do wrong to suppose that they yielded subjection to the Roman See. Iona was their Rome. They were not even in communion with the Papal Church; and the Latin and Celtic clergy regarded each other with mutual suspicion and dislike. No churches were as yet dedicated to St Peter; they bore the names of Columba, Drostan, and other native saints. The British Church firmly refused to receive Augustine as its archbishop. The Scottish Church was not moved by the letter of Pope Honorius in regard to the observance of Easter; and when Colman lost the day at Whitby, rather than yield, he took the relics of Aidan and retired to Iona. The Romanists retaliated in their own way,—they denied the validity of

---

[1] The biographies of Columba, Aidan, Finan, &c., are full of these.

[2] The bones of Columba found no rest, and for centuries were being perpetually carried hither and thither, from Ireland to Scotland, and from Scotland to Ireland. The bones of Aidan (or rather a share of them) were carried away from Lindisfarne by Colman. (Bede.)

[3] Bede specially mentions that Aidan induced many to fast on these days.

[4] Columba, when near his death, promised to intercede for his brother when he got to heaven. (Adam. Vit. Col.)

[5] In Adamnan's Life of Columba, we find one Fiachna throwing himself at the feet of the Saint and confessing his sins. Upon which Columba said, "Rise up, son, and be comforted; thy sins which thou hast committed are forgiven." (Lib. i. cap. xvi.) Adamnan himself, the author of this biography, according to Bede, was wont to confess to a priest, and perform severe penances. (Lib. iv. cap. xxv.)

[6] When Columba heard of the death of Columbanus, "I must," said he, "to-day, though I be unworthy, celebrate the holy mysteries of the eucharist, for the reverence of that soul which this night, carried beyond the starry firmament betwixt the holy quires of angels, ascended into Paradise." (Adamnan, lib. iii. cap. xvi.) The whole subject is dispassionately and learnedly discussed by Usher in his "Religion of the Ancient Irish."

Scotch orders. Accordingly when Wilfred was chosen Archbishop of York in the room of Colman, he refused to receive ordination at the hands of the Scots, as being out of communion with Rome; and prayed that he might be allowed to go beyond the sea, and receive ordination from the hands of catholic bishops.[1] His prayer was granted; but as he loitered in France, his enemies had their revenge, and induced the king to have Chad appointed to the See of York in his absence. But this being done, great difficulty was felt in regard to his consecration, as only one bishop was to be found in all England who could be recognised as having been canonically ordained.[2] Consecrated, however, he was, though he afterwards required to submit to be consecrated again, to make his apostolical succession sure.[3] Animated with this spirit, certain Saxon bishops, who had become the abettors of Rome, met in conclave, and issued the following decree:—"Such as have received ordination from the bishops of the Scots or Britons, who in the matter of Easter and the tonsure are not united to the Catholic Church, let them be again, by imposition of hands, confirmed by a catholic bishop. In like manner also, let the churches that have been consecrated by those bishops be sprinkled with exorcised water, and confirmed with some service." The decrees of this council go on to declare that baptismal chrism and the eucharist were to be denied to all such schismatics till they professed their adherence to the one Church; and that, on their doing so, though baptized before, they were to be baptized again.[4] Such were the formidable consequences which followed their stubborn adherence to a worn-out almanac, and a Simoniacal tonsure.

Such contumely on the part of the Romanists had its natural effect on the minds of the British clergy, and no doubt also on the minds of their brethren in the north, though our information is confined to the former. They repaid contumely with contumely, hatred with hatred, and excommunication with excommunication. Did a Catholic seek the society of the Welsh Christians, he was first put upon a penance of forty days.[5] Did he speak of his church and his faith, he was told

---

[1] Usher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, chap. x. He quotes as his authorities Bede, William of Malmesbury, and Stephen's Life of Wilfred.

[2] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book iii. chap. xxviii.

[3] Ibid., book iv. chap. ii.

[4] Concil., Tom. vi. col. 1877.

[5] Usher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, chap. x.

he was no better than a heathen.[1] Upon such religious heartburnings the bards could not be silent; and a lay of Taliessyn, honoured by the Welsh with the title of "Ben Beirdh," or chief of the bards, has descended to our time, in which a woe is pronounced upon the priest who does not guard his flock from Roman wolves.[2]

The feeble ray of light let in upon the ecclesiastical condition of Scotland by the writings of Cumin, Adamnan, and Bede, perished before the expiry of the eighth century, and for the next three hundred years we are left in hopeless darkness. These centuries we know contained events of vast political importance, as it was during them the Scottish and Pictish monarchies were merged in one; and they must have witnessed ecclesiastical changes equally great, as such lengthened periods of time always do. When the light begins again to break, we meet for the first time, in the records of the period, the name "Culdee" applied to a body of the Scottish clergy. The first mention of them is in the Chartulary of St Andrews, in which it is recorded that Brude, the last king of the Picts, according to ancient tradition, had given the island of Lochleven to God, St Serf, and the Culdee hermits there. After this, notices of these Culdees are not uncommon; and, notwithstanding the dark ages which have intervened between the landing on Iona and the founding of the priory of St Andrews, we need have no hesitation in identifying these Culdees as the direct descendants of the ancient Columbites.[3] Culdee simply signifies a monk.[4] The record in the Chartulary points back to a time when the Pictish kingdom was still

---

[1] Bede, Ecclesiastical History, book ii. chap. xx. "It is to this day," says this historian, "the custom of the Britons not to pay any respect to the faith and religion of the English, nor to correspond with them any more than with Pagans."

[2] Usher gives the original Welsh of this lay, with the translation, from the Chronicle of Wales, p. 254.

[3] Dr Grub in his Ecclesiastical History of Scotland concedes this (vol. i. p. 230); Dr Burton seems reluctant to allow it, but does not expressly deny it, nor attempt to explain who the Culdees were if not the descendants of the Columbites.

[4] *Ceal* in Gaelic signifies a retreat; *Cealdeach* is applicable to a person fond of retirement; and that Culdee is sprung from the same root with these words becomes more evident when we look to its Latinised form. *Keledeus*, which probably preserves the ancient pronunciation. Dr Burton, following Dr Reeves, thinks it is derived from the Celtic Céle-dé, servant of God, the first half of the phrase still existing in the modern "gilly." The old pedantic derivation of Cultores Dei is now abandoned.

in existence. Moreover, there were Culdees in other countries besides Scotland—they were to be found in England, in Wales, in Ireland, from which St Columba had come, and we have the name there much earlier than in Scotland. They may have changed since the days of Columba—no doubt they had—but they still preserved the collegiate life which he founded, though they had long lost the missionary zeal which he inspired. It is certain they had struck their roots deep into the soil; they had religious houses at Dunkeld, Abernethy, Brechin, Monifieth, St Andrews, Dull, Deer, and the other centres of the ancient population; and they were possessed of immense tracts of land. Their abbots were frequently laymen, and in this fact we have either a remain of the old idea that the monk need not be a priest, or an example of what afterwards repeated itself at the time of the Reformation, and even before it—a powerful laic seizing upon the Church's inheritance, and holding it under an ecclesiastical name. These lay abbots ranked with the greatest nobles, and in the case of Crinan, Abbot of Dunkeld, were connected with royalty.

The Culdees never submitted to the decrees of the Papacy in regard to celibacy. Many of them were married men. St Patrick was the son of a deacon, and the grandson of a priest. In a synod said to have been held by the same saint, together with Auxilius and Isserninus, there was a special decree that the wives of the clergy should not walk abroad with their heads uncovered.[1] Mylne relates that the Culdees of Dunkeld had wives, after the manner of the eastern church, but that they abstained from them when they ministered in their courses.[2] It is thought that in the Gaelic names of Macpherson, MacVicar, and MacNab, we have evidence of descent, it is to be hoped legitimate, from some ancient parson, vicar, or abbot. Indeed, the ancient royal line had Culdee blood, for the "gracious" Duncan was the son of Crinan, Abbot of Dunkeld, who had a daughter of Malcolm II. for his wife. But not only did the Culdees marry; they were frequently succeeded in office by their sons. In the Registry of St Andrews there is mention of thirteen Culdees who held their places by inheritance.[3] Giraldus Cambrensis informs us that, even so late as his day, it was common among the Culdees of Wales for "the

---

[1] Usher, chap. v.

[2] Vitæ Dunkeldensis Ecclesiæ Episcoporum, p. 4.

[3] Habebantur tamen in ecclesia Sancti Andreæ, quanta et qualis ipsa tunc erat, tredecim per successionem carnalem, quos keledeos appellant.

sons to get the churches after their fathers by succession, and not by election, thus possessing and polluting the Church of God."[1] The same practice prevailed in Ireland, for we find Pope Innocent III. writing to his legate there, Cardinal Salernitan, to use his endeavours to abolish the custom whereby children succeeded to their fathers and grandfathers in their ecclesiastical benefices.[2] In like manner we find Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, stating that when he was Bishop of Man, the canonries or prebends of the church of Clermont were transmitted hereditarily, so that there the canons were born canons, and that none of the clergy were elected except the bishop and abbot.[3] The transmitting of ecclesiastical offices by inheritance was well nigh as great an evil as the cutting off from the clergy all hope of doing so, by compelling them to celibacy. Our happiness in knowing that they escaped one error, will therefore be considerably abated by the discovery that they fell into an opposite and almost equally pernicious one.[4]

We have the architectural remains of these Celtic monks in the round towers of Abernethy and Brechin, and in a few heaps of stones, found chiefly in the most desolate of the Hebrides. Almost formless when looked at by themselves, they are pronounced by antiquaries to be of the same type as a few more perfect ecclesiastical ruins which exist in several districts of Ireland. There is always a group of buildings—a rectangular oratory or church, with a door at the west end and a window at the east, and a group of bee-hive-shaped cells built of unhewn, uncemented stones, and which evidently were the homes of the ecclesiastics. The whole is surrounded by a rude rampart.

But the Books of Deer, of Lindisfarne, and Kells[5] are much

---

[1] Successive quoque, et post patres filii ecclesias obtinent, non elective; hæreditarie possidentes et polluentes ecclesiam Dei. (Illaudabilibus Walliæ, cap. vi.) He lived in the end of the 12th and the beginning of the 13th centuries.

[2] Usher, Religion of the Ancient Irish, chap. 5.

[3] Epist. 55. See Goodall's Preliminary Dissertation to Keith's Catalogue of Scottish Bishops.

[4] The truth is, the compulsory celibacy of the Roman clergy was not general at the time when the Columbites were in their prime.

[5] The Book of Deer (of which an illustrated edition is published by the Spalding Club), has a special interest, as it contains, written on its margin and blank leaves, Gaelic memoranda of grants to the monastery, apparently in the twelfth century. From this it has been inferred that the language of Buchan was, at that time, Gaelic; but the memoranda prove only that there were Gaelic monks in the monastery. Two centuries

more interesting monuments of that time, and their beautifully interlaced decorations, showing high art, are in strange contrast with the rude structures which sheltered the artists. We must not forget, however, that the carvings on the clubs and other implements of savages are artistic in the highest degree. But be this as it may, these Culdees, in the first flush of their zeal, went forth as missionaries to almost every country of Europe—to France, Switzerland, Germany, Italy. They travelled in companies, and were marked by their unkempt hair, their coarse cloaks, their leathern wallets, their long walking sticks, like a band of primitive apostles. St Bernard mentions them, and their handwriting is still to be seen at St Gall and many other colleges and monasteries[1] of Europe.

In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, we find the Culdees struggling in the stream which ultimately carried them away. The Church Reform of St Margaret and her sons had begun, and the modern order of things came into contact with the antiquated. They were often at war with the Roman bishops, though now all but conformed to the Roman Church. The disputes, however, more frequently regarded tithes, lands, and privileges, than points of theology. At St Andrews, Dunkeld, Dunblane, and Brechin, there had been convents of Culdees from a remote antiquity, and when these places were constituted into bishoprics, the Culdees formed the bishop's chapter, and had the election of the bishops. But Roman influence was growing stronger every day, and as married Culdees were thought to derogate from the sanctity of a cathedral, they were gradually supplanted, and Canons-Regular substituted in their room. They lingered longest at Brechin; but with the fourteenth century they vanish.[2]

We get a glimpse of the religious character of this, the last age of Culdee supremacy, in the life of Margaret, the Saxon queen of Malcolm III., written by Turgot, her confessor. This royal lady, who has been honoured with canonization, though very superstitious, and somewhat ostentatious in her

afterwards, Barbour in Aberdeen wrote in Anglo-Saxon. Not to mention other circumstances, it was impossible there could be a change like this in two hundred years.

[1] Anderson's Rhind Lectures, 1879. Montalembert's "Monks of the West."

[2] Dr Ebrard, in his Handbuch der Christlichen Kirchen-und-Dogmen Geschichte, gives a glowing theory of the Culdees, which facts scarcely bear out.

acts of beneficence, nevertheless possessed many eminent virtues, and must be ranked among the best of queens. She exercised unbounded influence over her brave but illiterate husband, who, though unable to read her books of devotion, was accustomed fervently to kiss them. Every morning she prepared food for nine orphan children; and on her bended knees she fed them. With her own hands she ministered at table to crowds of indigent persons who assembled to share in her bounty; and nightly, before retiring to rest, she gave a still more striking proof of her humility by washing the feet of six of them. She was frequently in church, prostrate before the altar, and there with sighs and tears, and protracted prayers, she offered herself a sacrifice to the Lord. When the season of Lent came round, besides reciting particular Offices, she went over the whole Psalter twice or thrice within twenty-four hours. Before repairing to public mass, she prepared herself for the solemnity, by hearing five or six private masses; and when the whole service was over, she fed twenty-four hungry on-hangers, and thus illustrated her faith by her works. It was not till these were satisfied that she retired to her own scanty meal. But with all this parade of humility, there was an equal display of pride. Her dress was gorgeous, her retinue large, and her coarse fare must needs be served in dishes of silver and gold, a thing unheard of in Scotland till her time.

Fortunate in having obtained a good education, St Margaret was particularly fond of showing her learning and knowledge of the Scriptures. "Often," says her confessor, "have I with admiration heard her discourse on subtle questions of theology, in presence of the most learned men of the kingdom." She soon found abundant opportunities for exerting her eloquence and erudition in attempts to reform certain errors which had crept into the Church. About two hundred years before this period, the Roman Church had altered the time of observing Lent from the day following Quadragesima Sunday to the Wednesday before it; and, as usual, the Scottish clergy lagged behind. Ignorant of this, the Queen imagined the Roman Lent was the most primitive, and that her clergy had been guilty of introducing a novelty. "Three days," says Turgot, "did she employ the sword of the Spirit in combating their errors." But as she did not speak the language of the Culdees, her husband was obliged to act as her interpreter. Such a disputant was sure to win.

Whether from ignorance of history, or respect for their Queen, the Scottish ecclesiastics, though right, were convinced they were wrong, and henceforward observed Lent according to the Catholic institution. Triumphant in this, and probably urged on by her English confessor, the royal reformer addressed herself to other abuses. The clergy of Scotland at this period had ceased to celebrate the Holy Communion at Easter, and pleaded their unworthiness as an excuse for their neglect.[1] They are accused also of celebrating the mass with barbarous rites, but it has been conjectured that rites which appeared barbarous to Turgot may have been primitive, apostolic, and Presbyterian, though not Roman.[2] The Sunday, we are also told, was hardly observed; labour went on as on the other days of the week; and in this respect also it has been thought the Scotch Church contained in its matrix the petrified Christianity of earlier times. A few Scotchmen moreover did then, what a few Englishmen are beginning to do now—they married their deceased wife's sister, and some, with less delicacy and decency, married their step-mothers. The Anglican Margaret corrected these real or supposed abuses, and introduced the canons and usages of the Roman Church.

It is melancholy to think that the life of so good a queen was shortened by the severity of her fasts. They gradually undermined her constitution, and brought on severe stomach pains, which were removed only by death. She had a favourite crucifix, which is celebrated in history under the name of the Black Rood. The cross was of gold, the figure of ebony, and it was understood to enclose a piece of the true cross. She was lying, wasted and dying, with the crucifix before her, when her son Edgar arrived from the battle of Alnwick. "How fares it with the king and my Edward?" said the dying woman. The young man stood silent. "I know all," cried she; "I know all. By this holy cross, by your filial affection, I adjure you, tell me the truth." "Your husband and son are both slain," said the youth. Lifting her hands and eyes to heaven, she devoutly said, "Praise and blessing

---

[1] How like is this to revelations recently made in regard to some Highland parishes in our own day, in which a large proportion of the people are said to be unbaptized, and a still greater refused the Sacrament of the Supper, and for precisely the same reason.

[2] In the Historia Beati Reguli it is said, "Keledei namque in angulo quodam ecclesiæ, quæ modica nimis erat, suum officium more suo celebrabant." See also note, p. 91.

be to Thee, Almighty God, that Thou hast been pleased to make me endure so bitter anguish in the hour of my departure, thereby, as I trust, to purify me in some measure from the corruption of my sins; and Thou, Lord Jesus Christ, who through the will of the Father hast enlivened the world by Thy death, oh, deliver me!" While the words were yet upon her lips she softly expired.[1]

This narrative makes it obvious that the Culdees had degenerated since the days when they carried the blessings of Christianity among the Saxons of Northumbria, and compelled Bede, notwithstanding his Roman predilections, to do homage to the purity of their lives and the ardour of their zeal. They had sunk into a state of indolence and ignorance, and vital piety had given way to a meaningless superstition. Cut off from the rest of the religious world, they had become like a pool of water, left behind by the tide, separated from the wholesome agitation of the sea, and certain to stagnate. On the other hand, the Romish Church at this period was full of life and energy, actively and earnestly aggressive. It had lost the simplicity of the gospel, but it had preserved its proselytizing spirit. It was ambitious to embrace the world, although its ambition was rather Ecclesiastical than Christian —more to make men vassals of Rome than servants of Christ. It was eloquent in preaching good works. Nor had it preached in vain. Cathedrals were reared, monasteries founded, hospitals endowed. Every one was in haste to do something or give something for the Church or the poor. In St Margaret we have an embodiment of the spirit of her age. What ostentatious humility, what almsgivings, what fastings, what prayers! What piety, had it only been free from the taint of superstition! The Culdees were listless and lazy, while she was unwearied in doing good. The Culdees met her in disputation; but, being ignorant, they were foiled. Death could not contend with life. The Indian disappears before the advance of the white man. The Celtic Culdee disappeared before the footsteps of the Saxon priest. David, the son of Margaret—the saintly son of a sainted mother—ascended the Scottish throne; and the altar-fires of Iona, now smouldering in their ashes, went out under the strong rays of regal and pontifical splendour.

---

[1] Turgot's Vita Margaritæ. See also Lord Hailes' Annals.

CHAPTER V.

It is to monks we are indebted for the introduction of Christianity into our country, and its preservation during several centuries of barbarity and ignorance. We have already spoken of the apostolic labours of Ninian, Kentigern, Columba, and Cuthbert. These and several others have imprinted their existence indelibly on the Scottish memory; they have towns and churches still called by their names; and the fairs, in those villages where they were once revered as patron saints, are almost invariably yet held upon the days set apart for their honour in the calendar.[1] But time and Christianity had as yet done little towards softening the ferocity of the Scots and Picts. Having no longer the Britons to fight with, they turned their arms against one another, and the few stray notices we have of the eighth and ninth centuries are all of blood and battle. In truth, it was impossible that a few Culdee houses, scattered over Scotland, could make any powerful impression upon its people. They may have submitted to the rites of Christianity; but it is evident they were yet ignorant of its spirit, and, in all probability, with a few exceptions, knew nothing whatever of the doctrines it embraced. One of the last dim notices, however, which we have of a Pictish king is honourable to his humanity. It is recorded that Brude, the son of Derili, gave his sanction to the "law of St Adamnan," which exempted women and children from the butcheries and brutalities of war.[2]

In the ninth century the Pictish kingdom came to an end. The stray and dubious notices gleaned from ancient chronicles give us no certain information how this came about, but there is some ground for believing that a Scot king succeeded to the Pictish throne by his female ancestry, and welded the two peoples into one—as a Scottish king, in after ages, ascended the throne of England, and formed the whole island into one empire. Be this as it may, the Picts have vanished from history. It is thought they were ignorant of the use of letters, and it is certain they have bequeathed us no historical records;

---

[1] "The fairs of towns and country parishes," says the editor of the first volume of the Origines, "were so invariably held on the day of the patron saint, that where the dedication is known, a reference to the saint's day in the Breviary serves to ascertain the day of the fair."

[2] Robertson's Concilia. Eccles. Scot., Pref. xv.

so that had it not been for others, we should have been unaware of their very existence, though their blood flows in our veins. The Scots were probably as savage as they; but the monks who came among them from Ireland brought with them letters and religion.

It is recorded in the Registers of St Andrews, and in other ancient chronicles, that toward the close of the ninth century King Girg first emancipated the Scottish Church from Pictish servitude. This would seem to suggest that thus early the Scottish clergy had been brought under some species of Erastian bondage, and that they found a deliverer in Girg: but it is now thought the servitude referred to was only the exaction of certain secular services and exactions, as we find exemption from these carefully noted in some of the most ancient church charters.[1]

Bede frequently refers to the "bishops" of the Scots; but these were no other than Culdees, who, issuing from their cells, laboured like itinerant preachers among the half-naked barbarians. There were no diocesan prelates, and no parochial clergy in Scotland, till the twelfth century. But the work of constituting dioceses and parishes having begun, went rapidly on. Within a hundred years, the Bishoprics of St Andrews, Dunkeld, Dunblane, Glasgow, Moray, Aberdeen, Brechin, Ross, Caithness, Galloway, and Argyll, had all been erected. It is worth inquiring what was the cause of this sudden development of ecclesiastical vigour, if not of spiritual life.

The Christian clergy for many centuries depended entirely upon the free-will offerings of those whom they had converted to the faith. When Christianity became the religion of the empire, and when it began to be believed that the heavenly happiness of the departed might be expedited or increased by the prayers of the priests, donations and bequests of money and land became frequent, and from this source churches were erected and benefices endowed. When the clergy had obtained a still firmer hold upon the people, they began to preach the divine right of tithes. The same proportion of our substance which was exacted for the maintenance of the priests and Levites under the law was surely still more justly due to those who ministered at the altars of the New Testament. It was seldom at this period that the clergy preached or reasoned in vain. Though there is no mention of tithes in the codes of any of the Roman emperors, the payment of them came gra-

---

[1] Chron. de Mail, p. 224. Wynton, Chron. Scot. Book of Deer.

dually into use; and in the eighth century, the Emperor Charlemagne made them compulsory in his dominions, and piously declared, in his laws, that the devils had muttered in the air that the non-payment of the righteous exaction was the cause of a famine which had scourged the country.[1] Indebted to the Roman bishop for having placed the imperial crown upon his head, he still further repaid the boon by the rich offerings which he laid upon the shrine of St Peter; and his irresistible arms were ever at the service of the Church, to enforce baptism upon reluctant pagans, or to free Rome from troublesome Lombards. In his time the Church grew to a greatness it never had before.

Alfred the Great appears to have imitated in England the policy of Charlemagne. When he came to the throne he found religion almost totally extinguished by the constant incursions of the heathen Danes. The monasteries had been razed to the ground; the monks dispersed; in many provinces the whole Church service had been discontinued; and the king laments that he had found but one priest south of the Thames, and very few north of the Humber, who could understand the Latin liturgy. Alfred set himself to build up the Church which had fallen down. He invited learned ecclesiastics to his kingdom, made his own daughter the abbess of a nunnery, expressly enjoined the payment of tithes, and devoted much of his own time to works of piety.[2] The virtues, learning, and liberality of Alfred had an influence upon the whole kingdom; religion became a fashion, and churchmen mightily increased; so that two hundred years afterward, when William the Conqueror made his survey of the kingdom, he found in it 45,017 ecclesiastics, with not a little territory in their hands.

This mania to enrich the Church, travelling northward, soon began to infect Scotland. In the year 1057 Malcolm

---

[1] Omnis homo ex sua proprietate legitimam decimam ad ecclesiam conferat. Experimento enim di dicimus, in anno, quo illa valida fames irrepsit, ebullire vacuas unnonas a dæmonibus devoratas, et voces exprobationis auditas. Such is the decree of the Council of Frankfort. Selden and Montesquieu both regard Charlemagne as the legal author of tithes. (See Gibbon, Hist., chap. xlix.) "The civil power was first interposed in support of the right in the reign of Charlemagne, who, in 778, introduced them into his dominions in France and Germany, by the following law:—'Ut unusquisque suam decimam donet, atque per jussionem episcopi sui dispensetur.'" (Leges Longobard. per Lindenbrogius. Connel on Tithes, book i. chap. i.)

[2] Asser's Life of Alfred.

Canmore was crowned King of Scotland at Scone. In 1066 the Normans landed on the coast of Sussex, and the battle of Hastings was fought, which decided the fate of England, and placed a new dynasty on the throne. Many of the Saxons fled into Scotland to escape from their Norman masters; and among others, the royal Edgar, with his mother and two sisters. Malcolm welcomed the refugees, gave them fitting entertainment at court, and soon made Margaret, the elder of the sisters, his Queen. The learning, virtues, and piety of this lady we have already recorded. From this period we find a stream of Saxon and Norman settlers pouring into Scotland. They came not as conquerors, and yet they came to possess the land. With amazing rapidity, sometimes by royal grants, and sometimes by advantageous marriages, they acquired the most fertile districts from the Tweed to the Pentland Firth; and almost every noble family in Scotland now traces from them its descent. The strangers brought with them English civilisation, and English attachment to an ecclesiastical hierarchy, and it is to their influence and example we must attribute the establishment and endowment of the hierarchy in the country.

Notwithstanding the devout spirit which animated Malcolm and his queen, they appear to have made few donations to the Church. The endowment of a Benedictine establishment at Dunfermline, and a small grant of land to the Culdees of Fife, are the only instances of their liberality which have been traced. The two elder sons of Malcolm, Edgar and Alexander, both evinced their piety by founding monasteries; but his youngest son, David, who ultimately succeeded to the throne, was by far the most liberal benefactor of the Scottish clergy, and bought at a great price the honour of Roman apotheosis. He founded the Bishoprics of Glasgow, Brechin, Dunkeld, Dunblane, Ross, and Caithness. A bishop had been located at Murtlich; him he translated to Aberdeen, and bestowed upon him ample revenues. St Andrews had been raised to opulence by his immediate predecessor.[1] If the remaining Scottish Sees had any existence prior to his reign, it is certain no succession of bishops can be traced, nor till now had they any grants of tithes and lands, so necessary to the proper constitution of a bishopric. The same pious liberality called into

---

[1] The Bishops of St Andrews probably had some possessions before this period, but they must have been inconsiderable. Alexander I. made them a grant of a large territory known by the name of the Boar's Chase.

existence a multitude of abbacies, priories, and nunneries, and monks of every order and in every garb swarmed in the land. He founded no fewer than fourteen or fifteen religious houses, and richly endowed every one of them. "He was a sore saint to the crown," said James the First of Scotland.

The proprietors of land followed the example of the monarch, and their English culture predisposed them to do so. Having acquired their feudal charters with the king's + or seal attached, they began to settle and improve their manors. Perhaps upon their ground they found an old religious house already existing, but if not they built a church and tithed the manor for its support. It was thus that tithes, and parishes, and a parochial clergy, were first called into existence. The words "parson" or "vicar" do not occur in any charter before the time of David I.[1]

But the rise of our BISHOPRICS, the origin of our PAROCHIAL SYSTEM, and the establishment of our MONASTERIES are deserving of a more minute investigation.

As we have already seen, the original ecclesiastical system of Scotland was Abbatial, and not Episcopal—tribal rather than diocesan. But churches sprung up apart from the mother monastery, and the clergy who took charge of these were the earliest bishops. We have traces of such bishops of St Andrews from the close of the ninth century, but they had no circumscribed diocese—they were simply bishops of the Scots. It was more than two hundred years later before the diocesan system of England was introduced by Alexander I. He appointed to the SEE OF ST ANDREWS Turgot, his mother's Anglican Confessor, and probably the prompter of all her Anglican reforms. The transaction was brought out into clear historic relief by the rival claims of York and Canterbury to consecrate, and the resistance of these by the Scotch monarch and clergy. The church had not yet learned to limit its pretensions to the boundaries of nations. Bishop Robert, the third of his line, erected the Church of St Regulus, and soon afterwards the noble Cathedral of St Andrews was begun, and slowly built up during a century and a half, and finally consecrated in the presence of Robert the Bruce in the beginning of the fourteenth century. The SEE OF GLASGOW dates from the year 1116. In that year David, Prince of Cumberland, and afterwards King of the Scots, directed an inquest to be made regarding the See, which resulted in its being put in possession

---

[1] Collections, p. 230. Connel on Tithes, book i., chap. ii.

of many valuable manors scattered over the whole south of Scotland. In the same century the Cathedral Church which still stands, the noblest architectural structure in the mercantile metropolis of the west, was begun. It was consecrated in 1197, and completed by Bishop Bondington, who died in 1258. At DUNKELD, as Mylne, the historian of the See, relates, Constantine III., King of the Picts, instituted a Culdee House about the year 729; which was converted into a cathedral church in the twelfth century, when David I. was pushing on his ecclesiastical reformation. The transmutation was facilitated by the first mitre being conferred upon the old Culdee abbot. Policy would dictate the offer, and ambition would embrace it. Thus was the new church system, erected on the ruins of the old; ancient Culdee houses frequently forming the basis of the new cathedral churches. It is needless to trace the origin of all the bishoprics, as those we have given will illustrate the origin of all.

The division of the land into dioceses was quickly followed by its division into PARISHES. The lord of the manor, led by the example of the monarch and his own English ideas, erected a church for the instruction of his vassals, and tithed the soil for the maintenance of the priest. The manor and the parish were thus in general identical. The parish being thus made coincident with the manor, frequently followed its future fortunes. If a detached piece of land was subsequently added to the original possession, it sometimes became also a part of the parish, and this accounts for the divided and fragmentary character of some parishes at the present hour. On the other hand, when a large manor was subsequently split into several smaller ones, it sometimes was felt to be desirable that each should have a separate church, and thus the division of land was followed by a division of parishes. In this way the parishes of Crawford John, Roberton, and Symington branched off from the original parish and manor of Wiston. In other cases a thriving burgh sprung up in the midst of a parish, and required a church, a burial-ground, and baptismal font for itself. It was thus that the parish of Edinburgh was taken out of the heart of St Cuthbert's, and Aberdeen from the parish of St Machar.[1] Besides these, other causes concurred to the erection of new parishes, and the division of old ones, and fre-

---

[1] Introduction to the first volume of Origines Parochiales.

quently led to conflicting claims and bitter disputes about privileges and tithes, altarage dues, and fees for the baptism of infants, and for the burial of the dead.[1]

In tracing the origin of our parishes, we have, in fact, also traced the origin of tithes and patronage; for when a parish church was erected, the tithes of the soil were required for the maintenance of the priest, and the lord of the manor very naturally assumed the right of presenting to the benefice. The system was the growth of circumstances rather than the result of any legislative plan; but than it none better could have been devised to carry Christianity into every hamlet and every home. By dividing the land, it subdued it. The noble gave proof of his piety by endowing the Church with the tithes of his manor, and the Church more than repaid the benefit by its humanising influence upon the serfs who tilled his soil and followed his banner to battle. Even the right of patronage was then an unmixed good, for it bound the clergy to the native aristocracy, and so far freed them from the foreign domination of their spiritual head, and the ignorant villains had not yet dreamt of the indefeasible right of the Christian people to choose their own bishops and priests.

Before the parochial system had time fully to develop itself, and exhibit its capacity for reclaiming and instructing a whole population, it was well-nigh destroyed by the introduction of a new element. The parochial clergy, in a multitude of instances, were jostled out of their places by MONKS, or if allowed to continue at their work, they were cozened out of their legitimate revenues, which were appropriated to the support of some Religious House, with a high

---

[1] The great extent of the ancient parishes, and the difficulty of passage to the parish church, frequently led to their division. Thus the parish of Glenbuchat was separated from the parish of Logie, because on one occasion, while the people of the Glen were on their way to the parish church to keep Easter, they were caught in a storm, and five or six persons perished.

We have said nothing of Chapels in the text. Very frequently a nobleman took a pride in having a chapel on his own grounds for the convenience of his own household. These erections were numerous in Roman Catholic times.

Collegiate Churches were the growth of the fifteenth century. They had no parishes attached to them. They were instituted for Secular Canons performing divine service and singing masses for the souls of their founders and their friends. They were governed by a Dean or Provost. Of such Collegiate Churches there were thirty-three in Scotland.

savour of sanctity. We have already alluded to the rise of monachism, and its introduction into Scotland by Columba and the Culdees; but that primitive form of it had passed away, and now, with a new organisation and restored vitality, it came and reconquered the land.

The first monks were completely independent of one another; they belonged to no order, and were obedient to no rule; but each, in his own cell, inflicted upon himself any amount of torture he pleased. But now they were all marshalled into different societies, and made subject to a particular discipline; and from the fidelity and courage with which, in serried array, they fought the battles of the papacy, they have been appropriately called the militia of Rome. As opposed to the secular clergy they were called Regulars, because they followed some rule. The Augustinians followed the rule of St Augustine; and the Benedictines the rule of St Bennet. These were the two most ancient orders, and the most famous. Under the former were comprehended the regular canons of St Augustine, the canons of St Anthony, the Præmonstratenses, the Red Friars, and the Black Friars or Dominicans. Under the latter there were the Benedictines of Marmoutier, of Cluny, of Tyron; the Bernardines or Cistercians; and the monks of Vallis-Caulium. Besides all these, there were the Franciscans, the Carthusians, the Carmelites or White Friars, and others still of inferior name. Some of these did not come into existence till the twelfth and thirteenth centuries; for every age threw off its own swarm. The divisions we have given depended upon the rule which the Religious obeyed, the leader they acknowledged, or the place where they originated; but there was another division which crossed these—for all the orders we have enumerated subsisted either on the endowments which their houses had acquired, or by begging. They were therefore divided into *Rented Religious* and *Mendicant Friars*.[1] The Black, White, and Grey Friars were all mendicants. The rules under which the various orders lived were extremely various—some excessively rigid, and others comparatively mild; but there were three vows common to them all—obedience, chastity, and poverty.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, an intense passion to found and endow monasteries seized upon Scotland. That of Dunfermline was founded by Malcolm Canmore;

---

[1] Spottiswood's Religious Houses, also Walcott's Ancient Church of Scotland.

Coldingham, by Edgar; Scone and St Columba on Inchcolm, by Alexander I. David, with pious prodigality, erected and endowed Jedburgh, Kelso, Melrose, Newbattle, Holyroodhouse, Kinloss, Cambuskenneth, Dryburgh, and, besides these, a convent of Cistercian Nuns at Berwick-upon-Tweed. Many of these, however, were merely the transformation of ancient Culdee houses. Thus the revenues of the Culdee Monastery of Lochleven were bestowed on the Priory of St Andrews, and the Culdees were informed by the King in his Charter that if they chose to remain and obey the rules of the new-comers, they might, but that if not, they would be expelled from the island. The successors of these monarchs followed their devout example, and the nobles strove to emulate their kings. Many causes conspired to produce this. The monks and friars had a high repute for superior holiness, and they attracted the attention and won the veneration of a rude and superstitious age by the austerity of their lives, the fervour of their devotions, the fame of their preaching, and the self-inflicted pain of their penances. The rich and the great became their worshippers, and built them those beautiful houses, the very ruins of which still excite our admiration. Perhaps the noble, as he saw the abbey raising itself against the sky, with its ribbed doorways and richly-decorated windows, looked forward to the possibility of himself becoming a brother of the order, when age had cooled his martial ardour, and taught him to prepare to die; perhaps he was ambitious that a member of his family might be appointed its abbot; at all events, he had chosen its sacred enclosures as the place of sepulture for himself, his countess, and their children, and he never doubted but that the endowments he lavished upon it would secure the repose of their souls.[1]

---

[1] In the preface to the Origines we have examples of the operation of these motives. "In the reign of William the Lion, Robert de Kent gave a territory in Innerwic to the Monks of Melrose, adding this declaration, —And be it known, I have made this gift to the church of Melrose, with myself, and the monks have granted me their cemetery, and the service of a monk at my decease; and if I be free, and have the will and the power, the monks shall receive me in their convent." (Lib. de Melrose, p. 59.) "Gilbert, Earl of Strathearn, and his countess Matildis, who founded the monastery in 1200, declared that they so loved the place that they had chosen it as the place of burial for them and their successors, and had already buried there their first-born, for the repose of whose soul chiefly it was that they so bountifully endowed the monastery. At the same time they bestowed five parish churches upon it." (Lib. de Ins. Missar, pp. 3, 5.)

Lands, tithes, rights of pasture, of fuel, of fishing, were heaped upon the monks; and when all else failed, the parish church, with its revenues, was annexed to the monastery, to be held by it for ever. In this case, a paltry pittance was reserved for the impoverished parish priest who served the cure; or one of the monks performed the duty, and the monastery engulphed all. To such an extent was this system carried, that in the reign of William the Lion, no fewer than thirty-three parish churches were bestowed on the Abbey of Aberbrothock, then newly erected, and dedicated to St Thomas à Becket, the fashionable saint of the period, who for a season eclipsed even the glories of Mary.[1] At the time of the Reformation, of the thousand parishes in Scotland, about seven hundred had been appropriated to bishops and Religious Houses.[2]

The parochial clergy were crippled and humbled by the withdrawal of their revenues to pamper the monks, and to such a state of poverty and dependence were some of the vicars reduced, that the popes had to interfere to save them from the rapacity of the bishops and abbots;[3] and ultimately James III. passed an act forbidding any further appropriations, under the pains of high treason.[4] But the evil was already done; the secular clergy were degraded and wretchedly poor; the revenues of the Church had gone to fatten idle friars, who, whatever their primitive virtues may have been, were now the scandal of the Church; and if it be true they defended and supported the papacy for a time, it is certain they made its downfall more dreadful in the end.

Mr Spottiswoode, in his account of the Religious Houses that were in Scotland at the time of the Reformation, has enumerated one hundred and twenty monasteries, besides more than twenty convents for the reception of nuns; and though his list is the fullest that has yet been given to the world, it is said there were at least other forty monastic establishments, which he has omitted to mention. There must therefore have been nearly two hundred such institutions

---

[1] Origines, Introduction to vol. i.

[2] Connel on Tithes, book i. The exact number of parishes before the Reformation is unknown. It is certain that very many ancient parishes have been suppressed since the Reformation. Thus, within the bounds of the Presbytery of Auchterarder, there must have been once nearly twice the number of parishes there are at present, the majority of the modern parishes being a combination of two or three ancient ones.

[3] Connel, book i., chap. iii.

[4] James III., parl. vi., chap. xliv. 1471.

in our country. We have no Monasticon from which we can learn the number of their inmates, but we may safely estimate them at between two and three thousand.[1] Dunfermline appears to have had from thirty to fifty monks; and Paisley, Elgin, Arbroath, Kelso, had probably as many. In 1542 Melrose is said to have contained three hundred, but this is manifestly a great exaggeration. When the convent of the Grey Friars at Perth was demolished in 1559, only eight friars belonged to it; but it is probable there had been a considerable number of deserters before this.[2]

Of Mr Spottiswood's list, forty-eight were occupied by Augustinian monks, thirty-one by Benedictines, and forty-one by the three orders of mendicants, viz., fifteen by the Dominicans or Black Friars, seventeen by the Franciscans or Grey Friars, and nine by the Carmelites or White Friars.

Of the *Augustinian* establishments, Scone, Lochleven, Monimusk, Pittenweem, Holyroodhouse, Cambuskenneth, Jedburgh, Inchaffray, Abernethy, &c., &c., were occupied by canons-regular. Whitehorn and Dryburgh were in possession of the Præmonstratenses; and Red Friars were settled at Aberdeen, Dunbar, Dundee, and several other places.

Of the *Benedictine* establishments, the most famous were those at Coldingham, Dunfermline, Kelso, Kilwinning, Aberbrothock, Paisley, Melrose, Newbattle, Culross, and Pluscardin. All these monasteries were possessed of large revenues. They had great tracts of land, rights of pasture, of fishing, of hunting, of multure, besides the teinds of many parishes. Merely as landed proprietors the abbots must have exercised a prodigious influence. Many of them wore the mitre, had seats in Parliament, and exercised episcopal jurisdiction over all the churches subject to the monastery.

There was an establishment of Carthusians at Perth, founded by James I.; but this brotherhood, in their white gowns, scapulars, and capuchins, were never to be seen in the

---

[1] In a note to Dalyell's Dissertation on Ane Booke of Godly Songs, there is mention made of an ancient memorial to the Queen Regent (we suppose Mary of Guise), in which there is an estimate of the religious foundations at that time in the kingdom. There were, according to it, 13 bishops, 1 Lord St John, 60 abbots and friars; of Trinity Friars, Carmelites, Cordeliers, &c., about 50 places; provostries, about 50; 11 deans; 11 archdeans; 11 chanters. The parsons are estimated at about 500; the vicars, 2000; religious men and women, 1114; other priests, 1000; in all, about 4600 persons living on rents.

[2] See note to Dr M'Crie's Life of Knox, Period First.

streets of St Johnstone, for their gloomy rule compelled them to eat in solitude, to observe a constant silence, and never to leave their cloisters. But every town in Scotland swarmed with the begging friars, black, white, and grey. The Dominicans exercised their peculiar privilege of preaching everywhere without the permission of the bishop, and confessing all noble ladies and their lords, to the infinite chagrin of the curate, who had hoped to hear the secrets of the hall; but, more especially, they had a keen scent for heresy, for to their order belonged the imperishable honour of having instituted the Inquisition, preached the crusade against the Albigeois, and poisoned with the hostie a refractory king. The barefooted Franciscans prowled about in their long grey gowns, with a cowl on their neck, and a rope about their waist, begging alms for the love of God; and the Carmelites, who pretended to be the successors of Elijah and Elisha, were distinguishable by their white habits, and competed with the other two mendicant orders for the veneration of the people. Unclean and odorous then as they are now, while the pious might be edified by their touch, the polite would not willingly remain long in close proximity to their persons.

But it still remains for us to mention two celebrated orders—the Knights of St John and of Solomon's Temple, who, combining the military and monastic life, were wonderfully fitted to gain the admiration of an age at once martial and superstitious. The Hospitallers or Knights of St John took their rise from some merchants of Melphis, who, previous to the Crusades, had obtained from the Caliph of Egypt permission to erect a church and hospital in Jerusalem for the entertainment of Christian pilgrims. Conspicuous for their bravery at the siege of the Holy City, when Godfrey led his victorious Crusaders within its walls, he bestowed upon them large possessions, and from a church which they had erected in honour of St John, and an hospital for the reception of the sick, they derived the name by which they were known. Formed into a regular monastic-military order, they took a vow to defend pilgrims against the infidel Saracens, and assumed as their peculiar dress a black habit with a cross of gold, having eight points enamelled white, in memory of the eight beatitudes. Their ranks were soon filled with the most illustrious youth of Europe; and so scrupulous were they in regard to those whom they admitted, that every entrant was obliged to prove his nobility for four generations, and that he had been born in

lawful wedlock; unless, perchance, he was the bastard of a king, for royal blood alone could wipe out the disgrace of illegitimacy. Introduced into Scotland by David I., where there were no pilgrims to defend, and no infidels to fight with, they yet found favour with the people, and acquired numerous residences, the chief of which was at Torphichen, where the Preceptor of the order resided. They had hospitals both in Edinburgh and Leith.

The Templars, like the Hospitallers, were the offspring of the Crusades. The constant danger to which the kingdom of Jerusalem was exposed by the incursions of the infidels was the occasion of their institution. They followed the rule of St Augustine, and the constitution of the Canons-Regular of Jerusalem, and vowed to defend the temple and city, to entertain pilgrims, and guard them safely through the Holy Land. They wore a white habit, embroidered with a red cross; and these martial monks soon became the terror of the Moslem, and the firmest bulwark of the Christian throne. Nine thousand manors scattered over Europe rewarded their services and courage, and enabled them to support a regular army for the defence of Palestine. They obtained a footing in Scotland about the same time as the Hospitallers, and soon there was scarcely a parish in which they had not some possession. In Edinburgh and Leith numerous houses belonged to them, and when these were feued to seculars, the cross of the order was affixed to the highest point of the gable to mark out its superiors. The temple near Southesk was their principal residence; but those numerous designations of land still in use, in which the adjunct of *temple* occurs, are a pretty sure index of the ancient possessors. The Knights of the Temple fell as quickly as they rose. Their wealth begat insolence and pride; their monastic vows were forgotten amid the license of the camp and the court; and the world was scandalised by the corruption, avarice, and imputed crimes of the soldiers of the Cross, who retained nothing of their first virtues but their fearless and fanatic bravery. The order was suppressed in the fourteenth century; many of the knights were cruelly put to death for vices charged upon them, but never proved; and in Scotland and elsewhere, a large part of their property was transferred to the Hospitallers. It has been suspected that their wealth hastened their ruin.

It was not to be expected that the female mind, ever susceptible of religious impressions, should withstand the tend-

ency to monasticism at that time so prevalent. At Edinburgh, Dalmulin, Berwick, St Bathans, Coldstream, Eccles, Haddington, Aberdeen, Dunbar, and several other places, there were nunneries; and within these, ladies connected with many of the noblest families in the land. The nuns of Scotland revered, as the first of their order in our country, a legendary St Brigida, who is fabled to have belonged to Caithness, to have renounced an ample inheritance, lived in seclusion, and finally to have died at Abernethy in the sixth century. Church chroniclers relate, that before Coldingham was erected into a priory for monks, it had been a sanctuary for nuns, who acquired immortal renown by cutting off their noses and lips to render themselves repulsive to some piratical Danes who had landed on the coast. The sisterhood of Lincluden were of a different mind, for they were expelled by Archibald, Earl of Douglas, for violating their vows as the brides of heaven, and the house was converted into a collegiate church.[1]

History contains no record of the influence which these devoted virgins exercised upon the Church or the world; and we may believe that, shut up in their cloisters, and confined to a dull routine of daily duty, they could exercise but little. They would chant their matins and vespers, count their beads, employ themselves with needlework, and in many cases vainly pine for that world which their parents or their own childish caprice had forced them to abandon; but the world could not witness their piety, nor penetrate their thoughts. Yet men are strangely moved by the very sight of walls, within which are enclosed women who have devoted their virginity to God, and who are supposed to serve Him without any admixture of those passions which mingle so largely in other breasts; and no doubt the very existence of nunneries, and the religious mystery which shrouded their inmates, must have had their power in moulding the piety of the times, though it was unconsciously exercised, and too secret in its operation to be traced.

Though the Roman hierarchy was long of obtaining a firm footing in our country, when once established it soon reached a height of power and opulence unsurpassed in any other portion of Europe. The barbarity and ignorance of our ancestors inclined them to superstition, and their superstition inclined them to prodigality. Before the Reformation one-half of the whole national wealth had passed into the hands of the clergy,

---

[1] Forbes's Treatise of Church Lands and Tithes, p. 22.

which is proved by the fact, that they paid one-half of every tax imposed upon land, and there is little reason to believe that they would bear an unequal proportion of the burden.[1] This enormous wealth must have been almost all accumulated in the course of four centuries—from the twelfth to the sixteenth; and whatever use we make of it, we should not shut our eyes to the contrast between the religious liberality of the period which preceded, and that which has followed the Reformation. The entire riches of the Church were the result of private donations and bequests; the free-will offerings of a piety, which, though mistaken, must have been sincere. Almost surpassing the lavish liberality of the kings, who thus alienated nearly all their royal demesnes, were the gifts of the great earls; and in the thirteenth century we find with astonishment an Earl of Strathearn dividing his wide property into three portions, one of which he bequeathed to the See of Dunblane; a second to the Abbey of Inchaffray; and the third only he reserved for the inheritance of his family.[2]

So large a proportion of the national wealth locked up, in our day, in the coffers of the clergy, who are excluded from putting out their coin to usury in mercantile transactions, would be an unmitigated evil, and would most seriously cripple the operations of trade. But it admits of question as to whether it was an evil four hundred years ago, or whether the soil could have been in better hands than in those of the ministers of religion? There were few traders in those primitive times superior to pedlars, and their humble traffic required little capital. Had so many rich manors not passed into the possession of the Church, they must have remained in the possession of the great barons; and surely it was well for the country that they were transferred from the men of war to the men of peace.

The clergy everywhere introduced agriculture and the arts. Columba had fields waving with corn, and barns filled with plenty in his dreary island of Iona, when there were few corn-

---

[1] This is the estimate both of Dr Robertson and Dr M'Crie. Sir George Mackenzie estimates the tithes paid to the clergy at a fourth part of the rents of lands, and their lands at another fourth. Forbes remarks that the clergy were most justly subjected to the payment of the half of the taxt-roll in all public compositions. Keith says that it is ascertained by the public records that in the case of extraordinary taxations on land, one-third was paid out of the lands of the clergy. See Connel on Tithes, book i. chap. iii.

[2] Fordun, Scotichron, lib. viii. c. 73.

fields or granaries in Scotland. St Mungo, according to the legend, "yoked the wolf and the deer to his plough," and the legend has its much meaning. Around every monastery were extensive orchards, with trees grafted by the hands of the monks, and laden with fruits nowhere else to be found in the country. The industry and arts of the monks were copied by their dependents, and the traveller could at once discern, by the superior cultivation of the fields, and the more contented look of the peasantry, the districts that belonged to the Church. The clergy were confessedly the best landlords; they gave feus, and let out their farms upon long and easy leases, and in this way they encouraged the reclaiming of moors and marshes which might otherwise have lain waste to the present hour.

The immunity from war enjoyed by the Church and its vassals greatly favoured the improvement both of the land and of those who tilled it. The retainers of the fierce barons, who divided with the clergy the property of the soil, were constantly harassed by military duty; they were liable at any moment to be called upon to join in a raid against the English or some hostile chief in the neighbourhood, to burn, plunder, and slay; and amid such scenes, they lost all relish for the arts of peace; besides, they were at all times subject to have retaliated upon themselves the havoc they had wrought upon others; and few men will sow fields when there is a strong probability that others will reap them. The tenants and retainers of the clergy were happily free from all this, and were liable to be called to arms only on urgent and general occasions; and so great was the respect for their possessions, that even in the case of national hostilities, they were generally spared. The clergy, with admirable prudence, encouraged this lenity, not only by the powers of superstition, but by checking anything like a marauding disposition on the part of their dependents; and the consequence was, that they enjoyed the blessings of perpetual peace in the midst of turmoil and war; they had light in their dwellings when darkness was in the land of Egypt.

But the clergy were not only the greatest agricultural improvers; they were the most learned men of the time, and, in fact, monopolized all the learning of the period. It was in the still cloister that the lamp of knowledge was kept burning, and had it been exposed to the rude winds of heaven in those stormy days, it would infallibly have been blown out. Notwithstand-

ing the many pictures we have of overgrown and lazy monks, sleeping away their whole lives amid the drowsy atmosphere of their conventual buildings, or spending their days and nights in wassail, swilling Bourdeaux, and rejoicing in venison, even in Lent—pictures which are perfectly true to life; yet it must be remembered that this was not always, and never universally the case. Many of the ancient clergy were thoughtful and studious men, adepts in the scholastic theology then in vogue, and well read in the canon and civil law, a knowledge of which was the surest road to ecclesiastical and political distinction. We must not be so ungrateful as to forget that, before the invention of printing, it was monkish pens that multiplied copies of the sacred Scriptures, and preserved to us those Greek and Roman classics which at length revived in Europe a love for literature, and which still delight and improve us in our hours of ease. It is the unwritten saying of Chalmers, that the accumulated revenues of the rich diocese of Durham were not misspent, since they had encouraged and fostered the genius of Butler: may it not be said, with still greater propriety, that our monasteries were not endowed in vain, if they have preserved to us our Homers and Virgils, and above all, our Bibles?

Without the assistance of the clergy, the business of the State could not have been conducted. A knowledge of letters was esteemed unbecoming on the part of the nobility; and Tytler declares, that during the long period from the accession of Alexander III. to the death of David II., it is impossible to produce a single instance of a Scottish baron who could sign his own name.[1] As a matter of course, almost the whole work of legislation fell into the hands of the clergy, and the fighting was left to the lay lords. The bishops and mitred abbots formed by far the most influential section of the parliament, and filled almost all the important offices of State. The Lord Chancellor was the first subject in the realm; and of fifty-four persons who held this high office from the dawn of history to the death of Beaton, forty-three were churchmen. The Lords of Session were supreme judges in all civil affairs; and by the original constitution of the College of Justice, the president and one-half of the senators must needs be ecclesiastics.[2]

A power so great was not unattended with honour. Most

---

[1] History, vol. ii.

[2] Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. Crawford's Officers of State.

of the dignified churchmen belonged to the first families in the land, and many of them were closely allied to royalty. Not only bishops, but abbots, took precedence of the greatest earls, and every clergyman was entitled to have "Sir" appended to his name, if he had not the higher academic title of "Master."[1] They managed to exempt their persons from the jurisdiction of the civil tribunals, as too sacred to be there dealt with; and the reputed sanctity of the sacerdotal character was enough at all times to screen the delinquent priest from the hands of justice or the fury of private revenge. To assault an ecclesiastic was a crime for which nothing but death could atone.

It is to churchmen, moreover, we owe the earliest annals of our country. At a period when we have not a single chronicle of political events, we have numerous Lives of the Saints, and all of these throw less or more light upon the general history of the times. Adamnan, Bede, Jocelin, Ailred, Turgot, have given us glimpses of the flow of events and the state of society in their day—regarding which, but for them, there had been impenetrable gloom. But every great monastery in Scotland appears to have kept three different kinds of registers, and many of these have survived the waste of time and the zeal of the Reformers, and they now form the principal guide of the historian in traversing these dark ages. The first was a general one, giving an account of the principal events, according to the years in which they occurred—as the Book of Paisley, and the Chronicle of Melrose. The second was an Obituary, in which were recorded the deaths of the abbots and priors, the kings and great nobles, and the chief benefactors of the monastery. The third was their Chartulary, in which were carefully transcribed the charters granted them by kings or pious nobles who had endowed their house, the bulls of the popes, a statement of their revenues, taxes, leases, and lawsuits, and a multitude of other minute particulars, no more intended to serve for history than the accurate accounts of an exact housekeeper, but which do in reality, above all other documents, illustrate the spirit and character of the times. Of these are the Book of Dunfermline, the Register

---

[1] There is a curious instance of this in the trial of Walter Mill the martyr. When he was addressed Sir Walter, he repudiated the title, declaring he would no longer be one of the pope's knights. See Spottiswood's History, Fox, &c.

of Arbroath, the Chartulary of Inchaffray, and many others, most of which have recently been brought from the shelves of our great libraries and the charter-chests of our nobles, and given to the world by the labours and liberality of the Bannatyne and Maitland Clubs.

We must still further award to the monasteries the honour of having been the first Educational Institutions in the country. The Monastery of Iona was as much a seminary for learning as a school of piety; and there can be little doubt but that the other Culdee establishments took it for their model, and that from them there issued men, not merely practised in monkish austerities, but accomplished in the scanty literature and science of the day. At a subsequent period, when Roman ideas became dominant, it was customary for the Scottish clergy to resort to Oxford or Paris to complete their education, as their native country was still unprovided with Universities; and this led David, Bishop of Moray, in the year 1325, to found the Scots College at Paris, for the reception of his countrymen. But though Scotland could not yet boast of a University, it was not without schools. So early as the twelfth century, there were schools at Abernethy and Roxburgh, at Perth and Stirling, and soon after at Glasgow, Ayr, Berwick, and Aberdeen, and probably in many other places, though we have no record of their existence; and all these were necessarily under the management of the clergy. The monks of Kelso had the charge of the school at Roxburgh, and the monks of Dunfermline of those at Stirling and Perth. But besides, almost every monastery must have been less or more a seminary of education for the sons of the nobility and aspirants to the priesthood. We know it was so at St Andrews, where the youth ambitious of literary fame was instructed in the quodlibets of Scotus; and in the Chartulary of Kelso we find a certain Matilda, widow of Richard of Lincoln, Lord of Molle, making a grant of rents to the abbot and monks to board and educate her son William with the best-bred boys entrusted to their care.[1]

Last of all, it must not be forgotten that monasteries served at once as inns and poor's-houses, when regular hostelries were scarce, and poor-laws unknown. The hospitality

---

[1] Chart. de Cal., f. 71. I have derived my information about our early schools chiefly from Tytler's History, vol. ii., the Origines, and a note in the Appendix to Dr M'Crie's Life of Knox.

of the monks was proverbial. The traveller, overtaken by night, was sure to find a kindly welcome, a cheerful supper, and a wholesome though hard bed, in the first convent he came to. The brothers of the order counted the news he brought from the wide world, and perhaps a small coin bestowed at the shrine of a favourite saint, as a sufficient recompense. It is so in many Catholic countries at the present hour. But the wants of the poor as well as of the wayfarer were attended to. The beggar in his distress, afraid to approach the baronial hall, came crouching to the convent-gate, and it was not often that assistance was refused. It is related, that in the reign of David I. a sore famine prevailed in Scotland. Four thousand half-famished wretches repaired to the Abbey of Melrose, reared their huts in its neighbourhood, and waited for the beneficence of the brethren; and Waltheof, the Superior, ordered them all to be fed. There is something touching in the lament of Father Hay on the fall of the Monastery of Iona. "The monks," says he, "were driven away, and the revenues turned to profane uses; whence the poor were defrauded of continual alms, strangers of entertainment, the servants of God of their necessary food and clothing, the souls of the pious faithful of their sacrifices, the church of as many prayers, and God of the worship due to Him."[1]

From the rapid sketch we have here given of the rise of our ecclesiastical institutions, it will be seen that the union of Church and State in our country was the growth of circumstances, rather than the result of any specific legislation. No Act of Parliament proclaimed it. Churchmen gradually acquired lands and tithes by voluntary grants; and the State protected them in the enjoyment of these, as it would have done any other class of its subjects. The holders of property had a right to sit in the Parliament; and thus bishops and abbots acquired their seats, and, on account of their sacred functions, came to be regarded as a separate Estate. Ecclesiastics alone could perform marriages and draw wills, the necessity being a religious one in the one case, and a literary one in the other; and hence they naturally acquired a jurisdiction in all matrimonial and testamentary affairs. From the time of James I., it was the pious practice of almost

---

[1] Scotia Sacra, p. 487. In Roman Catholic times there were also many hospitals, endowed by the pious, superintended by the clergy, and specially designed for the entertainment of strangers and the poor.

every Parliament to begin its business by an Act ratifying all the rights and privileges of the Church; but, in truth, every subject was entitled to the same justice which was thus, in a complimentary manner, rendered to the Church. Every religious body has this kind of establishment now, in as far as every religious body is protected by law in the enjoyment of its property and privileges, and is amenable to law for the use of these.

It is unnecessary to say much regarding the liturgical rites of the Scottish Church, but it were wrong to overlook them entirely. The Culdees had a liturgy peculiar to themselves, which they boasted to have derived from St Mark.[1] There is still in the Advocates' noble library a MS. liturgy, described, though without authority, as Liturgia Sancti Columbani Abbatis, written in the Anglo-Saxon or Irish character, and which probably dates as far back as the eleventh century.[2] There is in the possession of the family of Perth another MS. Missal or Sacramentary, written in a similar character, and equally ancient. We may regard these as belonging to the Culdee period. At what time the Roman liturgy superseded the Culdean we cannot exactly determine, but we may infer that the Roman ritual came with the Roman hierarchy. It was the use of Sarum that prevailed in Scotland, as it did in a large part of England and Ireland.

This usage derives its origin from St Osmund, who was Bishop of Salisbury towards the close of the eleventh century.[3] It differed in some particulars from the ritual of the Church of Rome, but such differences were not thought to interfere with the unity of religious worship. In fact, in the Romish communion, considerable liturgic latitude was allowed; and bishops were permitted, within certain bounds, to prescribe liturgies to their own Churches. In the fifteenth cen-

---

[1] Usher's Religion of the Ancient Irish.

[2] My information upon these ancient liturgies is derived from the Preface to the Aberdeen Breviary, written by Dr Laing. Bannatyne Club edition.

[3] "He (Bishop Osmund) buylded there a new chyrche, and brocht thyther noble clerkes and cunnynge of clergye and of songe, soo that this byshop hymself shonned not to wryte and lymme (illuminate) and bynde bukis. Also he maid the ordynall of the servyce of the holy chyrche, and named it the Consuetudynarie. Now well nygh all Englonde, Wales, and Irelonde used that ordinall." (Polychronicon, lib. vii. chap. iii., quoted in Preface to Aberdeen Breviary.)

tury, it was believed that the use of Sarum was introduced into Scotland by Edward I.[1] There was an absurd tradition that he had destroyed all the old Scottish Service-Books, and introduced the Anglican one. But we have good evidence that the usages of the Salisbury Cathedral had been introduced into the country long before, and in a more peaceful way. We have already seen the Saxon St Margaret fleeing to Scotland, marrying its king, setting herself zealously to reform its Church. We have seen her arguing with Culdee monks, and by a royal, though erroneous arithmetic, correcting their calendar. Her biographer farther informs us that she found the mass celebrated with barbarous rites, which she laboured to abolish, and managed to introduce a new and a better form.[2] It was undoubtedly the more ornate usage of some Anglican Church. But our knowledge becomes more definite when we descend a single century. Herbert was consecrated Bishop of Glasgow in 1147; and we know that he settled the use of Sarum in his cathedral, and that this was shortly afterwards confirmed by a Papal bull.[3] It soon became universal: it was used at St Andrews, Moray, Aberdeen, in every cathedral and church in the kingdom.

We have still preserved in our public libraries many old Service-Books, but none of these can now be identified as having belonged to the Church. In truth, the Service-Books in use in the churches must have almost all perished at the Reformation, when it was esteemed a work of piety to burn them. But, happily, the Breviary of Aberdeen still remains to us, "which is the only existing use proper to Scotland, and is therefore of importance to those who regard with interest such an authentic record of the forms and usages of the Scottish Church."[4] This great work was prepared and completed under

---

[1] The following is Blind Harry's account of the matter:—

"The Bishoppis all inclynit to his croun,
Baith temporal and the religioun;
The Romane bukis that thar wer in Scotland
He gart thame beir to Scone, quhair they thame fand,
And, but redeme, they brynt thame all ilk ane,
Salisbury use, our clerkis than his tane."

[2] "Præterea in aliquibus locis Scottorum quidam fuerant, qui contra totius Ecclesiæ consuetudinem, nescio quo ritu barbaro missas celebrare, consueverant, quod regina, zelo Dei accensa ita destruere atque annihilare studuit, ut deinceps qui tale quid presumerit, nemo in tota Scottorum gente appareret." It has been argued from this passage that the Culdees celebrated the Lord's Supper in the primitive form. If it do not prove that, it warrants the belief that up to this time the Culdees were ignorant of many of the ceremonies superadded by the Romish Church.

[3] Preface to the Aberdeen Breviary.

[4] Ibid.

the superintendence of the celebrated William Elphinstone, Bishop of Aberdeen;[1] and it is probable that some of the lessons appointed to be read on the festivals of the Scottish saints were written by himself. It challenges a still higher interest, from the fact that the art of printing appears to have been first introduced into Scotland to multiply copies of it for the use of the churches.[2]

Tytler is of opinion that organs and choirs were used in Scotch cathedrals as early as the thirteenth century.[3] At that time there lived a Scottish friar of the order of St Dominic, named Simon Taylor. At Rome and Paris, we are told, he applied himself to the study of that part of the mathematics which treats of sounds and harmony, and became a mighty proficient. Returning to Scotland, he found the music of the churches rude and barbarous, and burning with a musician's zeal, he made a proposal to reform it; and when the bishops and clergy accepted his services, he set himself to the work with such energy and success, that an ancient historian of the Bishops of Dunblane declares, that in a few years he brought matters to such perfection that Scotland might have competed with Rome for musicians. This Simon Taylor further showed his musical lore by publishing four treatises, entitled *De Cantu Ecclesiastico Corrigendo*, *De Tenore Musicali*, *Tetrachordorum*, and *Pentachordorum*.[4]

His improvements, however, do not seem to have been universally acknowledged even by those who lived nearer his time, for he was not well in his grave till we find St Ælred, in his "Mirror of Charity," thus breaking forth against the

---

[1] It is now reprinted by both the Maitland and the Bannatyne Clubs.

[2] Up till this time, the Service-Books in use in the churches were in MS., or printed in France, with the Scotch saints added to the calendar in writing. But on the 15th September 1507, James IV. gave a grant of privileges to Walter Chepman and Andrew Millar, two burgesses of Edinburgh, who had undertaken to procure and bring home printing materials. In this charter of privileges we have this clause :—"It is devisit and thocht expedient by us and our counsall, that, in tyme cumming, mess buikis, manualis, matyn buikis, and portuis buikis, efter our awin Scottis use, and with legends of Scottis sanctis, as is now gadderit and eket by ane Reverent father in God and our traist counsalour William, bischope of Aberdene, utheris be uset and generally within our realme, als soone as the sammyn may be imprentit and providit, and that na manner of sic buikis of Salusberry use be brocht to be sauld within our realm in time cuming, and gif ony does the contrair that they sall tyne the sammyn." (Registrum Secreti Sigilli, vol. iii. fol. 29.)

[3] History, vol. ii.

[4] M'Kenzie's Lives of Scotch Writers.

modernized music:—"Since all types and figures are now ceased, why so many organs and cymbals in our churches? Why, I say, that terrible blowing of bellows, that rather imitates the frightsomeness of thunder than the sweet harmony of the voice? For what end is this contraction and dilatation of the voice? One restrains his breath, another breaks his breath, and a third unaccountably dilates his voice, and sometimes, which I am ashamed to say, they fall a quivering like the neighing of horses; then they lay down their manly vigour, and with their voices endeavour to imitate the softness of women; then, by an artificial circumvolution, they have a variety of outrunnings; sometimes you shall see them with open mouths, and their breath restrained as if they were expiring, and not singing, and, by a ridiculous interruption of their breath, seem as if they were altogether silent; at other times they appear like persons in the agonies of death; then, with a variety of gestures, they personate comedians,—their lips are contracted, their eyes roll, their shoulders are moved upwards and downwards, their fingers move and dance to every note; and this ridiculous behaviour is called religion, and where these things are most frequently done, there God is said to be most honourably worshipped."[1] Those in our own day, who object to organs and choristers, could desire no more vehement advocate than this Roman abbot.

The last echoes of the choral singing have long since died away; but the cathedrals and churches, whose long aisles were once filled with them, still remain, some of them almost entire, others in ruins, and from these we may infer the splendour of the ancient ritual, and the vast resources at the disposal of the ancient clergy. Inferior in size to the great minsters of England, they yet rival them in their noble romanesque and pointed architecture; and though the country has increased a hundredfold in wealth since the time of the Reformation, we have not since that period erected one building that will vie with the cathedral of Glasgow or Elgin. But, perhaps, above all others, the great cathedral of St Magnus at Kirkwall, lifting its massive buttresses and walls, and its richly-mullioned windows, almost from the waste of waters, proves the power and splendour of the hierarchy which could have reared such a structure in such a solitude. Its foundations were laid, and a large part of it built, by a Norse earl, in the twelfth century, under the influence of a superstition which could convert

---

[1] M'Kenzie's Lives, vol. i.

pirates into the founders of churches; but it was not the wealth of the earl alone that gave to the Orkneys their High Church; the building was so liberally helped on by the oblations of a devout age, that all Christendom was said to have paid tribute for its erection.

The Culdee houses were originally built of timber; Candida Casa, and the church of Abernethy, were probably exceptions to the rule. We have already spoken of the ancient Monastery of Iona as being of wood; and Bede expressly tells us that the Church of Lindisfarne was constructed of logs of oak and thatched with reeds, after the custom of the Scots. All these humble structures have perished. The noble stone churches which still stand—too many of them in ruins—were all reared between the twelfth and the fifteenth centuries. It is almost certain that not one of these ecclesiastical buildings belongs to a period prior to the first of these dates; but from this time, till near the dawn of the Reformation, church-building went on at such a pace as to have called forth the splenetic remark, that the Gospel could not be heard for the sound of the hammer and trowel. Some of these ecclesiastical structures were chiefly reared by royal or baronial munificence, but the great proportion were reared by churchmen. Bishops set apart for the purpose large sums out of their episcopal revenues; every benefice in the district was taxed; subscriptions throughout the whole country, sometimes throughout all Christendom, were set on foot; the sale of indulgences was resorted to; and so the worshipful Freemasons were employed and paid; and the ribbed column and groined roof still testify to the exquisite skill with which they handled their mallet.

The history of the artificers who reared these edifices is somewhat curious. In the thirteenth century the Pope created a number of Italian, Flemish, and French artizans, with some Greek refugees, into a corporation of Freemasons, giving them high and exclusive privileges; and these travelling in companies from country to country, as there was occasion for their skill, are said to have reared many of the finest religious houses. The same mouldings, even to minute details, have been observed in buildings far separated from one another, proving that they were erected either by the same artificers or from the same designs. It is probable that these same men partly designed, as well as executed, the plans of their buildings; but it is also certain that ecclesiastics were the chief architects of the time, as they alone possessed such a

knowledge of mathematics and the mechanical arts as to fit them for the task. It has been observed, however, as a circumstance full of meaning, that no man knows the names of the architects of the cathedrals. "They left no record of themselves upon the fabrics, as if they would have nothing there that could suggest any other idea than the glory of that God to whom the edifices were devoted for perpetual and solemn worship; nothing to mingle a meaner association with the profound sense of His presence: or as if, in the joy of having built Him a house, there was no want left unfulfilled, no room for the question as to whether it is good for a man to live in posthumous renown."[1]

But though the names of the architects of our cathedrals have perished, we are able to glean from our ancient records some hints regarding their builders. Bishop Jocelin it was who laid the foundation of the High Church of Glasgow, and two years before he died he had the satisfaction of seeing its unrivalled crypt finished and solemnly consecrated. To Bishop Bondington we owe the magnificent choir. We next find the Chapter purchasing timber on the banks of Lochlomond "for the fabric of their steeple and treasury," and bargaining that their workmen should have free entry to the forest, and the right of felling, hewing, and dressing the wood wherever they pleased. In the Breviary of the Scottish Church we find a lesson appointed to be read commemorating the skill of the builder of another of her minsters—St Gilbert of Moray, who reared the cathedral of Dornoch. "He built it with his own hands," says the Breviary; and it is recorded that the glass used for the windows was manufactured at Ciderhall under his own eye. About the same period the cathedral of Elgin was lifting up its lofty towers on the opposite shores of the Moray Frith. Bishop Andrew laid its foundation, and the records of the See give us a glimpse of Master Gregory the mason, and Richard the glazier, at their work. But in 1390 the Wolf of Badenoch descended from the hills, and gave the noble building to the flames; and the bishop, in his complaint to the king, fondly speaks of it as having been "the pride of the land, the glory of the realm, the delight of wayfarers and strangers, a praise and boast among foreign nations, lofty in its towers without, splendid in its appointments within, its countless jewels and rich vest-

---

[1] Gladstone, quoted in *Quarterly Review*, June 1849.

ments, and the multitude of its priests serving God."[1] It afterwards, however, rose from its ruins, and by the liberal contributions of the faithful attained to at least its pristine magnificence. Thus were our great cathedrals founded and built. Designed by unknown architects, reared by travelling companies of masons, paid for by bishops out of the fruits of their benefices, and assisted by the free-will offerings of the people, they still stand, monuments of what may be done by piety in spite of poverty.

CHAPTER VI.

Our last chapter has been occupied more with the rise of institutions than with the course of events. It will be our duty now to trace these from the introduction of the Latin Hierarchy to the dawn of the Reformation. The field, though wide, is by no means crowded with ecclesiastical occurrences deserving of record. The higher clergy were very generally occupied with affairs of State; attending upon parliament, taking a part in embassies, acting in councils of regency; and the parsons and vicars who ministered in our parishes have left few memorials of their humble labours. In many cases it is impossible to dissever religious from political events, so closely were they interwoven, and kings as well as bishops must be introduced upon our canvass.

Some good men have longed for the complete identification of Church and State. Now, saving the fact that the Roman clergy had elevated themselves into a distinct caste, and claimed for themselves peculiar powers and privileges, the devout desire was much more nearly realised then than it is now. Religion and politics in our day are divided, as if their union were unnatural and wrong. The clergyman is bid to refrain from the least allusion to political topics, and the slightest sympathy with political contentions, and the member of parliament is thought to offend good taste, if not to violate the rules of the House, if he introduces any pious reflection or doctrinal discussion into his speech. There is room for doubt, if men do not thus put asunder things which God hath joined. In the mediæval ages, it was different; the Church and the State,

---

[1] See an interesting article in the *Quarterly Review* for June 1849, on Scottish Abbeys and Cathedrals.

if not completely one, with the same laws and the same lawgivers, were yet much more closely allied. Ecclesiastics were the principal politicians, and in Parliament they framed statutes for the government of the Church as well as of the kingdom. What is now called Erastianism was then little understood, and a law for the benefit of the Church was not thought to be the worse of having emanated from the State. The Church, of course, did form a separate community; but its councils were rare, and their canons comparatively few, and in this country, at least, it had very little individual action. The king and the bishops were generally at one, even in contests with the Pope; and happily Scotland never produced a Thomas à Becket.

The archbishops of York at a very early period asserted their primacy over the Scottish bishops. This probably arose from the circumstance of the Lothians having anciently formed a part of the kingdom of Northumberland, and from the other circumstance that, when Christianity was carried from Iona to Lindisfarne, it radiated thence northwards as well as southwards, and the powerful prelates of York, forgetting whence they had originally received their own consecration, began to arrogate jurisdiction over their brethren in Scotland, who had as yet no primate amongst themselves. When Alexander I., with the approbation of his clergy, had chosen Turgot, the confessor and biographer of his sainted mother, to the See of St Andrews, it so happened that the Archbishop of York was in the position of having been elected, but not yet consecrated, and as a rumour had reached Canterbury that, with the assistance of the Bishops of Durham and the Orkneys, he was about to consecrate Turgot, Anselm, then Primate of All England, wrote an imperious letter to his brother of York, absolutely prohibiting such consecration, and ordering him to compear at Canterbury, and be consecrated himself. York bowed its head before Canterbury, but did not relinquish its pretensions. While the two English archbishops were thus at war, the Scotch clergy maintained that neither of them had the right to what they laid claim. The decision of the triple controversy was evaded for the time, by the Kings of England and Scotland agreeing that the former should enjoin the Archbishop of York to consecrate Turgot, with a special provision that the authority of neither church was to be thereby compromised. Upon that understanding, Turgot received consecration on the 30th of July 1109.[1]

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

Upon the death of Turgot, Alexander wrote a letter to Ralph, the successor of Lanfranc and Anselm in the See of Canterbury, in which he artfully insinuated that in ancient times the bishops of St Andrews were wont to be consecrated either by the Pope himself *or* the Archbishop of Canterbury; that it was merely by sufferance that the Archbishop of York had ever exercised the right; and that this assumption of power could no longer be permitted. It is evident that the Scottish monarch wished to fight York with Canterbury, and to leave it undecided, if, after all, the Pope alone did not possess the coveted jurisdiction. The stratagem was skilful, and the time chosen opportune; for Thurstin of York, otherwise a formidable opponent, was at present half powerless by his own want of consecration, and the battle might have been quickly fought and won.[1] But delays took place, years slipped past, and still St Andrews remained without a bishop.

A.D. 1120. At length the Scottish monarch despatched a letter to the English primate, in which he censured himself for having so long allowed the flock to wander in the wilderness without a shepherd, and prayed him to set free Eadmer, one of his monks, that he might be raised to the Episcopate of St Andrews. The request was complied with, and Eadmer, loosed from his monastery, began his journey to the north; but he carried with him a letter from the Archbishop to the king, counselling that he should be sent back without loss of time to receive consecration. On his arrival in Scotland he was instantly elected to the vacant See by the clergy and people, under the sanction of the king—language which would seem to imply that the laity of St Andrews had a voice in the election of its bishops. Next day Alexander had an interview with the bishop-elect in regard to his consecration, and when Eadmer hinted at the pre-eminence of Canterbury over all the British churches, the monarch rose up, and broke off the conference with the strongest symptoms of displeasure. A month passed away before the king would again see the bishop; but then a compromise was come to, by which it was agreed that Eadmer should receive the ring from Alexander, take the pastoral staff off the altar, as receiving it from the Lord; and then, without more ado, assume the charge of the diocese.[2]

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

[2] Ibid. Eadmer himself has given us an account of these transactions, and authenticated his statements by original documents. Lord Hailes follows Eadmer, so that he may be regarded as a safe guide.

In the meantime, Thurstin was in Normandy with the English king, and, hearing of what was going on, he prevailed upon Henry to write to the Archbishop of Canterbury, prohibiting him from consecrating Eadmer; and also to Alexander, forbidding him to allow the consecration. All this disturbed the new bishop; he felt his influence in Scotland to be weak; his favour with the king at an end; some reforms he had designed had miscarried; and, above all, he was uneasy in regard to his consecration. He therefore craved permission to return to Canterbury and receive the blessing of the archbishop. Alexander refused the request, and reminded him that he had come to him altogether free. Eadmer retorted that he would not abdicate the honour of being a monk of Canterbury for all the kingdom of Scotland. The aspect of affairs grew daily worse, and the clergy in a body supported the king. In these circumstances, the perplexed prelate asked his friends what he should do, and they gave it as their opinion that he must either submit or leave the kingdom. His High Church principles prevented him from taking the former course, and so he returned the ring to Alexander, laid his crosier upon the altar, whence he had taken it, and returned to Canterbury, whose pretensions he had maintained with such unbending firmness, that neither ambition nor the love of independence could tempt him to set them aside.[1]

During the reign of the same monarch, and in the year 1122, the ambitious Thurstin again made trial of his strength, by requiring canonical obedience from the Bishop of Glasgow, but it was peremptorily refused; and when the Archbishop of York affected to suspend him from his episcopal functions, he appealed to Rome, and proceeded thither in person. The Bishop of St Mungo's appears to have gained his case, for when he still farther indulged his wandering propensities and went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and lingered for months with the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the Pope very properly recalled him, and enjoined him to return to his bishopric.[2] In 1123 Thurstin found still another opportunity to exert his prerogative. An English monk, named Robert, who had been Prior of Scone, was elected to the See of St Andrews, and the old question of consecration arose. Alexander died, and David I. came to the throne before the dispute was terminated. At length, in 1128, an arrangement was agreed upon, which allowed the consecration of the bishop to be proceeded with,

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

[2] Ibid.

but left the question of the liberties of the Scottish Church undecided. Thurstin was allowed to lay his episcopal hands upon Robert; and, at the same time, he executed an instrument by which he made it known to all men, present and future, that he had done so without any profession of obedience, solely for the love of God and King David, and without compromising either the claims of York or the rights of St Andrews.[1]

The prelates of York, though resisted at St Andrews and Glasgow, made a show of extending their jurisdiction still farther to the north. At this period they were in the habit of consecrating bishops of the Orkneys, and one of these we find with Thurstin in the English ranks at the battle of the Standard. As the Orkneys were at this time held by the Norwegians, and the constant scene of piratical warfare, it is difficult to believe that these Yorkshire bishops could ever set foot in their diocese; and we can account for the title they bore only by supposing that the primates of England had hit upon an expedient similar to that followed by Rome in our day, of appointing bishops to Sees *in partibus infidelium*. In the records of the cathedral of York there are also three entries of bishops of Glasgow in the eleventh century, who were never heard of on the banks of the Clyde. The proud prelates appear to have preferred a train of imaginary suffragans to none at all.

The reign of David I., which commenced in 1124, is the most important in the history of the Church before the Reformation. He wrought a change in ecclesiastical affairs almost as great as that which was subsequently accomplished by Knox. He in effect built up that which Knox, when it was in a state of decay, pulled down. He drave out the now antiquated Culdees, and introduced prelates and priests; Knox cast out the prelates and priests, and brought in Protestant preachers. The proceedings of the one, as well as of the other, are frequently spoken of as a Church reform. It is certain that David remodelled our whole ecclesiastical polity. He originated the hierarchy, and gave it its splendour. Nearly the half of our bishoprics, and the abbeys of Kelso, Holyrood-house, Melrose, Newbattle, Cambuskenneth, Kinloss, Dryburgh, and Jedburgh, were founded by his munificence. He brought several orders both of the Augustinian and Benedictine monks into the country, transplanting them from the great monas-

---

[1] Warton's Anglia Sacra.

teries of France and England; and it was under his favour that the Templars and Knights of St John took up their residence at Southesk and Torphichen. Many may think that the Celtic monks were better than their Latin successors, but it is certain they had degenerated since the days of Columba, that the church had sunk into decrepitude, and that new life required to be infused into it.

It is probable that David further wished to reform the whole State by the instrumentality of the Church, and to soften and refine the ferocity of the existing manners by a more educated clergy, and a more splendid ritual. "By his early converse with our countrymen," says William of Malmesbury, speaking of David, "his manners were polished from the rust of Scottish barbarity." It is not improbable the Anglicized monarch invited Anglican ecclesiastics into his kingdom, that they might confer upon his subjects the benefits he himself had received from his intercourse with the south. A far-seeing policy might also discern in the intelligence and wealth of the clergy a counterpoise to the exorbitant power of the turbulent barons; and whether David perceived the result or not, it is certain that the Church in almost every emergency stood fast by the throne, and helped to preserve a proper balance in the State. But whatever opinion we may form of David's policy, it is impossible to doubt of his piety; and his piety was happily of that healthy kind which made him neither faint-hearted nor weak-handed. He was strong in battle, wise in counsel, and merciful in the administration of justice to the poor. All historians are agreed that no better king ever sat upon the throne. His death was the appropriate termination of a well-spent life; for the monkish historian relates that, on a Sunday morning in May, just as the sun began to penetrate the darkness of night, his spirit, escaping from all earthly shadows, passed into the true light with such calmness that he did not seem to be dead, and with such devotion, that he was found with his hands clasped and stretched out toward heaven.[1]

David was succeeded on the Scottish throne by his grandson, Malcolm IV.; and, during his reign, Roger, Archbishop of York, having obtained from Rome legatine powers over all Scotland, summoned its clergy to meet him at Norham. The Archdeacon of Glasgow, the Prior of Kelso, and some other clergy obeyed the citation, but they did so only that they might appeal to the Pope; and proceeding to Rome, they procured

---

[1] Aldred. ap. Fordun, lib. v. cap. lix.

a bull of exemption from Alexander III.[1] But this ancient battle of our Church for spiritual independence was not yet come to an end.

On the death of Malcolm, his brother William, surnamed the Lion, was crowned king in 1165, and immediately set his heart upon the recovery of Northumberland from the English. Forming a confederacy with the rebellious son of Henry II., he marched into England, and laid waste the country with fire and sword; but his enterprise was brought to an abrupt conclusion by his being surprised and captured by a body of the enemy's horse. All Scotland was thrown into confusion and dismay by the loss of its king, and negotiations were instantly opened for his ransom. But Henry knew the full value of his prize, and resolved to part with it for no mean return. After three months consumed in vain attempts to lessen his demands, the Scotch ambassadors, who had repaired to Normandy, purchased the liberty of their king by surrendering the independence of the nation. The independence of the Church had well-nigh perished with that of the kingdom, but the dexterous diplomacy of the Bishops of St Andrews and Dunkeld made the clauses affecting it so indefinite and ambiguous, as to leave the discussion of the old question open for the determination of happier times. It was provided that the Scotch Church should yield to the Anglican bishops such subjection as it ought of right and was wont to yield—words capable of two very different renderings.[2] It was not long before the Scottish clergy had an opportunity of asserting the sense in which they understood them.

In the year 1176, Cardinal Huguccio Petrileonis, the Pope's legate, held a council at Northampton. Both Henry and William graced it by their royal presence. The English clergy resorted to it in great numbers. The Scottish clergy came thither also, aware of the important questions that were to be mooted, and resolved to maintain their rights. Huguccio, in papal pride, sat upon a seat higher than the rest, and the other ecclesiastics occupied positions according to their rank. The important subject was broached, and the Scottish clergy were required to fulfil the treaty of Normandy, by yielding to the English Church that obedience which they ought to yield and were wont to yield. The cardinal, according to Boethius, made a prolix speech, counselling submission, and expatiating

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, book ii. Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

[2] Rymer's Fœdera, vol. i. p. 30, 31.

upon the advantages that would arise from the union of the Churches. The Scottish clergy, however, neither daunted by the presence of the king, nor persuaded by the arguments of the legate, nor deterred by the thought that they were on English ground, maintained that they never had yielded subjection to the Anglican Church, nor ought they to do so now.[1]

The bold eloquence, on this occasion, of a young canon named Gilbert Murray, is celebrated by our ancient historians. "The Church of Scotland," said he, "ever since the faith of Christ was embraced in that kingdom, has been a free and independent Church, subject to none but the Bishop of Rome, whose authority we refuse not to acknowledge. To admit any other for our metropolitan, especially the Archbishop of York, we neither can nor will." When the Scottish canon had ended his speech, the Archbishop of York stepped up to him, and said, "That arrow came not from your own quiver."[2]

As the discussion proceeded, the Archbishop of York affirmed that the Sees of Glasgow and Galloway especially were subject to his authority. Jocelin pleaded that Glasgow was expressly exempted from any such obedience by papal authority.[3] What the Bishop of Galloway replied is not recorded; but at this point in the debate the Archbishop of Canterbury interfered, and declared that it was to Canterbury, and not to York, that the Scottish clergy must yield canonical obedience. The altercation which ensued between the Primate of England and the Primate of All England was the salvation of the Scottish Church; for though the Anglican clergy might have failed to establish any ancient usage in support of their claims, royal and legatine authority would have more than supplied the defect of precedents. The king and the cardinal bewildered, and probably disgusted by so many conflicting claims, broke up the assembly, and the Scotch ecclesiastics returned home free and unfettered.

A.D. 1178. But the Church of Scotland had hardly escaped this danger, when it was involved in a more serious quarrel with a more formidable opponent. In 1178 the Archbishop of St Andrews died, and John Scot, an archdeacon of the See, was elected by the chapter in his

---

[1] Fordun's Scotichron., lib. viii. c. 25.

[2] This young canon is the Gilbert who built the cathedral of Dornoch, and was sainted after his death.

[3] Registrum Epis. Glasg. i. 35. Robertson's Concilia Eccles. Scot., Pref. xxxvi.

room. The king appears to have been taken by surprise, for when he heard of the election, he swore by the arm of St James that John would never be Bishop of St Andrews. He was not a man to vow and not perform. He seized upon the episcopal revenues, compelled the other bishops to consecrate his own chaplain, called Hugh, and forthwith put him in possession of the bishopric. John appealed to Rome, and set out thither to look after his interests. The Pope appointed a legate to proceed to Scotland, to hear and determine the case ; and he, in an assembly of the Scottish clergy at Holyrood, pronounced judgment for John, and solemnly consecrated him. William had forborne thus far, but now he banished John and all his abettors from the kingdom, and by preserving Hugh in the benefice, set the Pope and his legate at defiance.

Thus thwarted and defied, the Roman pontiff issued a mandate to the Scottish clergy, ordering them to yield canonical obedience to John, and to bear in mind it was their duty to obey God and the Church rather than man. Not satisfied with this, he commanded the bishops forthwith to excommunicate Hugh ; and entrusted Roger, Archbishop of York, with legatine powers over Scotland, with instructions to excommunicate the king, and put the kingdom under an interdict, if John were not put in possession of St Andrews. John, who was a learned man, and who seems also to have been a good man, now interposed, and declared that he would rather renounce his dignity for ever, than that the masses said for the souls in purgatory should be intermitted for one day. But the Pope loved power better than the souls in purgatory, and so he commanded the yielding bishop, by his canonical obedience, to be firm.[1]

The Roman pontiff at this period was Alexander III., one of the ablest and most ambitious of the long line of able and ambitious men who have sat in the chair of St Peter. In the Council of Lateran, he had solemnly deposed the Emperor Frederic Barbarossa, absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and encouraged them to rise in rebellion. The emperor retaliated by marching upon Rome, compelling the proud pontiff to flee for his life, and setting Pascal on the apostolic throne. The fortunes of Alexander, however, gradually recovered, and Frederic was glad in the end to make terms of peace with him, and as some have affirmed, to

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. Spottiswood's History, book ii.

allow the triumphant priest to put his foot upon his neck. It was the same troubler of kings that encouraged à Becket to wage his spiritual warfare against Henry of England, and though the primate paid the penalty of his presumption with his blood, foully spilt before the high altar of Canterbury, he was everywhere worshipped as a martyr, William of Scotland himself raised a monastery in his honour, while Henry was compelled to go bare-footed to his tomb, and submit to be scourged as a penance. When William thought of these things he might well tremble and yield; but to yield was not the temper of the man. Frederic had yielded; Henry had yielded; but William never. He seems to have had a singular pleasure in adorning the tomb of one prophet of High Church principles, and in strenuously resisting the pretensions of another.

At length, in the year 1181, the Archbishop of York, as papal legate, fulminated a sentence of excommunication against the unbending monarch, and in conjunction with the Bishop of Durham, who was joined with him in the pontifical commission, laid the whole kingdom of Scotland under an interdict.[1]

Happily for William, death rid him of his enemy. At the critical moment Alexander died, and was succeeded in the pontifical chair by Lucius III., and the King of Scotland lost no time in sending ambassadors to kiss his toe, and request his benediction. The embassage was eminently successful: the sentence of excommunication was reversed, the interdict recalled, and in the bull issued by the new pontiff, it is specially set forth, that to reverence kings is an apostolic precept. After some difficulty and delay, the dispute about St Andrews was ingeniously settled, by both claimants resigning their pretensions into the hands of the Pope, when the Pope anew appointed Hugh to St Andrews, and John to Dunkeld, which happened at that time to be vacant. Lucius, still further to assure William of his friendship, sent him the golden rose and his blessing.[2] A great victory had undoubtedly been won.

A.D. 1188.

A few years later, Clement III., Servant of the Servants of God, addressed a bull to his most dear son William, illustrious King of the Scots, and his suc-

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. Robertson's Concilia, Pref. xxxviii.

[2] Hailes's Annals. Spottiswood's History.

cessors,[1] by which he set aside for ever the pretensions of Canterbury and York, and established the national independence of the Scottish Church. By this bull it is declared—"That the Church of Scotland is a daughter of Rome by special grace, and immediately subject to her; that the Pope alone, or his legate *a latere*, should have power to pronounce sentence of interdiction or excommunication; that none should be capable of exercising the office of legate except a Scottish subject or a member of the sacred College of Cardinals; and that no appeal concerning benefices should lie out of Scotland unless to the Court of Rome."[2]

Thus Scotland, to escape from the domination of England, placed herself under the broad shield of Rome, and Rome, by a masterly stroke of policy, received and protected the suppliant. But though our country was thus cast more completely into the bosom of the papacy, it was well that the pretensions of York and Canterbury were upset, for had it been otherwise, the ecclesiastical victory might have paved the way for a political one; the sense of independence being broken down in one sphere, might have yielded more readily in another; and, at all events, had the Churches become one, the Reformation would have taken the same course in both countries, and whichever form of worship—the Episcopal or Presbyterian—had prevailed, it would not, in all probability, have exhibited the same moderation as both these have happily exhibited in the sister countries; for who will doubt that the one has helped to check the excesses of the other?

It is worthy of notice, that at the very time the Church of Scotland was most strenuously asserting its independence, and repudiating the pretensions of York and Canterbury, it was quietly moulding its government and worship after the Anglican model, and inviting to its bishoprics, its abbacies, and its richest benefices, an Anglican clergy. Its cathedral constitutions were in general copies of English ones already existing. The chapters of Glasgow and Dunkeld are said to have been taken from that of Salisbury; and of Elgin, Aberdeen, and Caithness, from that of Lincoln. As with the

---

[1] Spottiswood quotes under this date a bull of Pope Innocent III.; but Innocent III. did not become Pope till 1199. In 1208, however, he issued a bull confirming the privileges of the Church, and Spottiswood has evidently confounded the two.

[2] Robertson's Concilia, Pref. xxxix.

cathedrals, so with the monasteries. Dunfermline was an offshoot of Canterbury, Coldingham of Durham, Dryburgh of Alnwick, Paisley of Wenloch, Melrose of Rievaulx. The catalogues of early bishops and abbots show how many of these were of Norman or Saxon, and how few of Celtic descent. Their names are generally enough to testify to their blood. Some of them belonged to the Norman and Saxon families who had recently settled in every district of Scotland, but the great majority of them were brought from the monasteries of England to fill the high offices in the Church.

This tendency to conform the Church of Scotland to that of England undoubtedly arose, in a great measure, from the influence of those English settlers, who were now rapidly obtaining, together with extensive territory, an ascendency in the councils of the kingdom. But we must also remember that, in copying Anglican models, the Church of Scotland only copied models which were now universally prevalent, from the wide-spread dominion of Romish ideas. The Church of Scotland, in short, by conforming itself to England, only conformed itself to Rome. But that the Church should have exhibited, at the same time, a determined resistance to English supremacy, and a fond desire for English conformity, is not a little remarkable; and the fact becomes still more remarkable when we reflect that the battle of the Church's independence was chiefly fought and won by Anglo-Norman priests; just as, in the age that followed, it was Anglo-Norman knights who achieved on Bannockburn the independence of the nation.[1]

The bull which secured the independence of the Church was brought to Scotland by John, Cardinal de Monte Celio, who also brought, as a gift from the Roman pontiff to the king, a sword richly set with precious stones, and a purple hat in form of a diadem. While this cardinal was in the kingdom, a convention of the clergy was held at Perth, in which all priests who had received ordination on Sunday were deposed, and a canon framed ordering Saturday from twelve o'clock to be observed as a holiday, and that the people at the sound of the bell should repair to church, and desist from their several crafts till Monday morning.[2] Thus, in the twelfth century, was a law passed, under the auspices of a

---

[1] Bruce, Randolph, Douglas, were all of Anglo-Norman descent.

[2] Spottiswood's History, book ii.

Roman legate, establishing the Saturday half holiday, which the crafts in the present day have managed to recover for themselves.[1]

The Crusades had now been raging for nearly a hundred years. Swarm after swarm of nobles and knights, of priests and peasants, had crossed the Bosphorus to combat with the infidel Moslem for the city where our Saviour had died and the sepulchre where he had lain, till Europe seemed to be loosened from its foundations, and hurled against Asia.[2] The victorious arms of Saladin had, towards the close of the twelfth century, recovered almost everything that had previously been lost, and Jerusalem was once again in the hands of the infidels. But Christendom could not yet relinquish a land associated with so much that was hallowed in religion, and now rendered doubly dear by the hundreds of thousands of Christian warriors who had perished by sword, famine, or plague upon its plains. A third Crusade was organized. Philip Augustus of France and Richard of England took the cross, and lent their wisdom and valour, the dignity of their royal names, and the resources of their great kingdoms, to the chivalrous enterprise. In order to convert a dangerous neighbour into a firm friend, and prompted also by his generous nature, Richard, before his departure for Palestine, restored to William the Lion everything which had been extorted from him while in captivity by Henry II.; and, in return, William agreed to pay to Richard ten thousand merks sterling—thus furnishing sinews for the Holy War—and to send with him his own brother David, Earl of Huntingdon, with a band of Scottish knights, to share in the dangers and glory of the expedition.[3] A few years later, Scotland contributed two thousand merks to redeem Richard from the captivity in which he was basely kept by the Emperor of Germany; but it is more than probable that this was an unpaid instalment of the ten thousand originally stipulated.

William, before the close of his reign, appears to have made

---

[1] It is a singular circumstance, also worthy of being noted, that, in the reign of James I., an act was passed very similar to the Forbes Mackenzie Act. "It is ordained that na man in burgh be foundin in tavernes of wine, aill, or beir after the straik of nine hours, and the bell that sall be rung in the said burgh." (Parl. xiii., chap. cxliv.)

[2] This was the figure of the Princess Anne, daughter of the Emperor Alexius. (Gibbon, chap. lviii.)

[3] Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

an effort to reform the evils which had arisen in Scotland and throughout all Europe, from religious houses having the rights of sanctuary—where the greatest criminals were safe, and law lost its power. He sought the advice of the Pope as to how he should deal with malefactors who had sought an asylum in the churches. Innocent III., in his rescript, made answer—"That if the person who retires into a church be a freeman, he must not be forced from thence, nor punished with the loss of life or limb, even for the most atrocious offences; but every other punishment which the law authorises may be inflicted upon him. Public robbers, however, and they who spoil the country by night, may be dragged out of churches, and this is no violation of the rights of sanctuary. If the person who retires into a monastery be a slave, he must be restored to his master after that his master has promised upon oath not to inflict any punishment upon him."[1] In an age when law is weak and revenge strong, it is possible to recognise the prudence and policy of having sanctuaries and cities of refuge, where the manslayer or other criminal may find a safe asylum from the avenger of blood, till guilt be proved and justice vindicated; but it is neither prudent nor politic to allow any place, however sacred, to shelter criminals, not only from private resentment, but from public law. The rights of sanctuary, as defined by Innocent III., must have seriously weakened the hands of justice in Scotland.[2]

In the papal rescript there is mention of slaves. It seems incredible to many that there should have ever been slaves in our country, and yet true it is that there were. There is ample documentary evidence to prove that a considerable proportion of the labouring population must have once been in this sad condition.[3] They were generally, though not always, attached to the soil, and bought and sold with it like beasts of burden. Their children and their children's children for ever were the property of their lord, and accordingly their

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i. Decr. Greg. iii. 44-6.

[2] Among the statutes of Alexander II., in the Regiam Majestatem, is one anent—"Them wha fleis to halie kirk." It is provided that in the case of those who declare themselves guilty but penitent, they must restore what they have stolen, swear upon the gospels they will never steal again, and then pass out of the realm till reconciled to the king. In the case of those who declare themselves innocent, they will be protected till they are tried, and then they must abide the law.

[3] In the Regiam Majestatem there is a complete code of laws in regard to native bondsmen, book ii. chap. xi.-xiv.

genealogies were carefully preserved, not from ancestral pride, but to serve as title-deeds do in the case of houses and lands. In the year 1178 William the Lion makes a grant of Gillandrean Macsuthen and his children to the monks of Dunfermline.[1] In 1258, Malise, Earl of Strathearn, bestowed upon the monks of Inchaffray, in pure and perpetual alms, Gilmory Gillendes, and this he does at Kenmore, on the day of the annunciation of the Blessed Virgin. The same pious earl, in the same year, bestowed upon the same religious house John Starnes, the son of Thomas and grandson of Thore, with his whole property and children which he had begotten or might beget; and this he did for the salvation of his own soul, the souls of his predecessors, and the souls of his successors for ever.[2] In some ancient documents there is mention made of *clerici nativi*, and these Tytler thinks must be serfs who had become clerks, and still continued to be serfs; but we know that personal slavery was inconsistent with the sanctity anciently ascribed to the clerical character, and are rather inclined to believe that the *clerici nativi* were bondsmen belonging to the Church.[3]

Slavery existed in Scotland, and the Church of Scotland gave it its sanction; but it must be remembered that a similar servitude existed at the time in almost every country of Europe, and was probably nearly inseparable from the state of society which then existed. It was undoubtedly different from the negro slavery which till recently existed in the Southern States of America,[4] and more nearly resembled the serfdom which

---

[1] Chartulary of Dunfermline, fol. 13.

[2] Chartulary of Inchaffray.

[3] Tytler's Hist., vol. ii. The view taken in the text is supported by the 13th chapter of the Regiam Majestatem, which is entitled, "Bondmen should not be promoved to halie orders." It starts with the proposition—"Servile condition is not capabill of the orders or honours of clerks." It is provided that if a slave, with the knowledge of his master, receives orders, he thereby becomes free; if without the knowledge of his master, he may be given back to slavery; but in that case he is stripped of his orders.

[4] In the Regiam Majestatem it is provided that a slave cannot purchase his liberty with his own property, for his property is already his master's; but if his master defile his wife, or draw blood of him above his breath, or allow him to remain unchallenged for seven years on another man's property, he is free.

It is amusing to find the Regiam Majestatem basing the institution of slavery upon the same scriptural argument as the American slave-owners were accustomed to use. "Bondage and servitude take ane beginning frae the drunkenness and ebrietie of Noah (for he pronounced Cham to be servant of servants to his brethren—Gen. ix. 24)." (Chap. xiv.)

has now been happily abolished in Russia, where it had lingered longer than in any other European country. It continued in Scotland till the fifteenth century, but had gradually been losing ground, and then it disappeared; but curious enough, driven from the surface of the soil, it took refuge in the mines, and lingered there in a modified form till last century.[1]

In 1214 King William died at Stirling, and was buried in the Abbey of Aberbrothock, which he himself had so magnificently founded and endowed. He was succeeded on the throne by Alexander II., who soon found himself involved in a war with John, the reigning King of England. This weak and passionate prince had first foolishly bearded the Pope, and then stooped so low as to accept the crown of England from his hands, and acknowledge himself the vassal of Rome. To war with England was now to war with the Holy Catholic Church, and this guilt was contracted by the king. Such impiety could not pass with impunity; and accordingly Gualo, the Pope's legate, came to Scotland, and excommunicated Alexander with his whole nobility; and to borrow the words of Balfour, "interdicted the kingdom from the use of any religious exercise, and solemnly, with book and bell, cursed all of whatsoever degree or quality that carried arms against King John."[2]

A papal interdict was the most awful ecclesiastical punishment that could be inflicted upon a guilty country; and was then generally regarded with the utmost consternation. The doors of the churches were shut, the services suspended. The images of the apostles and saints were taken from their pedestals, and placed upon the ground. Marriage could be performed only in the church-yard above the graves of the dead. No other sacrament saving baptism could be administered. The dying must be without the consolations of religion: for their souls no mass could be said; by their coffin no dirge could be sung—they must be buried like dogs. The whole population must continue under the wrath of God for a time, till the anger of the Pope should be assuaged. There is reason, however, to believe that the interdict was not felt in Scotland

---

[1] In some mining districts, till very lately, the miners were made over from one proprietor to another, together with the mines. It was the same with salters. They were ascriptæ glebæ—and could not be sold elsewhere. (Erskine's Institutes, bk. i. tit. vii. 61, and note.)

[2] Annals, vol. i.

in its utmost severity. The White Monks possessed the privilege of officiating at such times; and this they now diligently did, till they also were suspended by the legate, under the highest spiritual censures, from performing their merciful functions.[1]

From February 1217 till February 1218, our sanctuaries and high places were a desolation; but before the latter of these dates, Alexander, abandoned by his French ally, was glad to seek and find reconciliation with Rome. Now came the removal of the interdict. The Prior of Durham and the Dean of York came to Scotland as the deputies of the legate, "making their progress," according to Balfour, "from Berwick to Aberdeen, and absolved the kingdom from Gualo's curse and interdiction; and in their return home to England, being lodged in the Abbey of Lindores, the Prior of Durham was burned to death in his chamber, which took fire in the night by chance, his chamberlain being very drunk, and he fast asleep."[2] It appears that these deputies had also a commission to wring as much money as they could from the parish priests, many of whom, as a further penance, were compelled to go barefooted to the door of the church, and ask absolution in the most abject form.

The extortions of Gualo roused the indignation of the Scottish clergy, and three bishops proceeded to Rome to complain. On professing repentance, they easily obtained pardon; and the avaricious legate was compelled to disgorge one-half of his ill-gotten gains, which the Pope appropriated to himself, thus dividing the spoil with the spoiler. A cardinal who stood by remarked sneeringly, in reference to the mock penitence and absolution of the bishops, "that it was the duty of the pious to confess a crime even where no fault had been committed."[3]

A few years after this, a bishop of Caithness was horribly mutilated and burned alive in his own house at Hawkirk by the people of his diocese. A quaint annalist says, "that he was leading poor people's corn too avariciously;"[4] in other words, he was a rigorous exacter of tithes. The "Chronicle of Melrose" says that, like the good shepherd, he laid down his life for the sheep, rather than allow them to remain in their pristine ignorance as to the duty of giving a tenth to the

---

[1] Spottiswood's Hist., book ii.

[2] Annals, vol. i.

[3] Spottiswood, book ii. Hailes, vol. i.

[4] Balfour's Annals, vol. i.

church.[1] The Saga of Orkney gives a more minute account of the murder, and of the causes which led to it. It would appear that it was customary in Caithness to pay to the bishop a *spann* of butter for every twenty cows, but Bishop Adam exacted his spann for every fifteen, and then for every twelve, and ultimately for every ten. The dairymen of the north could not stand this, and seizing upon the greedy prelate, they roasted him at his own kitchen fire.[2] His death was amply avenged. A massacre was made of the peasantry. The Earl of Orkney, who it was thought might have stilled the tumult, had a large part of his property confiscated, and hardly escaped with his life, which he did not preserve very long, for a few years afterwards he was assassinated and burned in his own castle by his own servants, who it was suspected had been instigated to this studied mode of revenge. The murdered bishop was venerated in the Church as a martyr to the divine right of tithes, and ranked with St James, St Stephen, and St Laurence.

A.D. 1225. The Scottish clergy about this time represented to Honorius IV. that, from the want of a metropolitan, they could not hold a council; that in consequence of this, many crimes were committed without punishment, and many abuses allowed to grow up without the power to correct them. The Pope listened to their statements, and gave them permission to call provincial councils by the direct authority of the Apostolic See. The bishops met in virtue of this authority and appointed one of their number to be Conservator of their Statutes, and this official acquired considerable power in the Church. The king, on his part, appointed two doctors of civil law to attend these councils, and see that nothing was done in them to the prejudice of the State. We do not know how often they met, as we have no regular record of their proceedings; we only know that within fifty years of the bull which gave them being they framed some fifty or sixty canons, which were in force down to the Reformation; but some of these we recognize as the product of old legatine councils, and others are borrowed from the councils of other countries and general canon law.[3]

In 1230 Henry III. invited Alexander to York, where the two monarchs kept Christmas together, and feasted right royally for fourteen days. Amidst the festivities, the Cardinal

---

[1] Chronicon de Mailros, fol. 38, Ban. ed., p. 139.

[2] Ork. Saga, p. 421. Torfæus, lib. c. 40, quoted in Origines.

[3] Robertson's Concilia, Pref. l.-lv.

Deacon, who was legate in England, hinted to our monarch his intention of visiting Scotland, to inquire into ecclesiastical affairs. "I have never seen a legate in my dominions," replied Alexander, "and as long as I live I never will." The king said something more about the ferocity of his subjects, which might endanger the life of a visitor so obnoxious. The Italian took alarm, and abandoned his journey for a time; but some years after he came northwards, and was again withstood by the king, who would not allow him to cross the border till he obtained from him a written declaration that the present permission would not be drawn into a precedent.[1] The cardinal came to Edinburgh, held a council there, and levied some contributions from the clergy, but he was studiously avoided by the king; and apparently finding that little could be done, he returned to England without proceeding farther to the north. The Pope had condescended to publish a bull, declaring that it would evince a want of maternal affection to send a legate to England and not to Scotland; but it is plain that our ancestors never appreciated these proofs of his love.

Under the sanction of the papal bull, a Provincial Council was held at Perth in 1242, in which grievous complaint was made that nobles and knights were withholding their tithes, and otherwise sinning against the privileges of the Church; for even then all men were not equally loyal. But the pious monarch, attended by some of his great barons, came to the council and warned all men, of whatever degree, against violating the immunities of the Church or doing wrong to churchmen; and the royal warning had a salutary effect for all the years of his reign.[2]

The spirited resistance to papal extortion and encroachment exhibited by Alexander II. was continued by his successor Alexander III. In 1266 Cardinal Ottobon de Fieschi, afterwards Adrian V., while legate in England, attempted to raise in Scotland, as a procuration, six merks from each cathedral, and four merks from each parish church—an enormous sum, as the annual value of the parsonages at this period did not average more than ten merks, each merk, though it counts but 13s. 4d., being capable of purchasing a chalder of meal.[3] The

---

[1] Matthew Paris, Hist. Angl., p. 377.

[2] Fordun, Scotichron, lib. ix. cap. 59.

[3] "The following examples," says Lord Hailes, "will give a notion tolerable correct of the salaries of parish priests during the reign of Alexander III. Ten merks of silver, six acres of arable ground, and one acre of

king prohibited the contribution, and appealed to Rome; and the clergy generously raised amongst themselves two thousand merks to defray the expenses of the suit. So large a sum, it is evident, could be used only for bribery, but it was known that no empty-handed suitor ever gained a case in the papal court.

A.D. 1268. Foiled in his attempts at extortion, the legate, two years afterwards, summoned the Scottish clergy to attend a council in England; four of them went, but only to decline its jurisdiction, and observe its proceedings; and though canons were passed affecting our Church, they were held as null and void.[1]

The Roman pontiffs, at this period, were using their utmost endeavours to levy the tenths of benefices over all Europe, to defray the expenses of the Holy War. In 1254 Pope Innocent IV. granted to Henry III. of England a twentieth of the ecclesiastical revenues of Scotland for three years, provided he should join the Crusade which was then in agitation, and the grant was subsequently extended for another year. Henry III. wisely stayed at home, and the Scottish clergy escaped that ancient income-tax of five per cent. But in 1268, Clement IV. renewed the grant, increasing it to a tenth; and the gallant son of Henry put a cross on his shield, and repaired to Palestine. Still Scotland declined to be taxed by an English potentate. Blessed with a greater abundance of soldiers than of gold, an offer was made to send a company of crusaders to uphold the national piety and honour; and, accordingly, a

---

meadow, were provided to the vicar of Worgs in Galloway. This grant was confirmed by Gilbert, Bishop of Galloway, who died in 1253. In 1268 a pension of ten merks sterling was granted to the vicar of Kilrenny in Fife; of ten merks to the vicar of Salton in the Lothians; of ten pounds to the vicar of Childrer Kirk; . . . . twelve merks were provided to the vicar of Gulan. . . . . Hence we may presume to fix the actual medium at ten merks. The canons of the Church of Scotland, A.D. 1242 and 1269, fix the minimum at ten merks." (Annals, vol. i.) The price of grain varied as much anciently as now; but in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, a merk appears to be nearly the average price of a chalder. "In 1263 a chalder of oatmeal, fourteen bolls being computed for the chalder, cost exactly one pound. In the same year, six chalders of wheat were bought for nine pounds three shillings. In 1264 twenty chalders of barley sold for ten pounds; in 1288 the price had fallen so low, that we find forty chalders sold for six pounds thirteen shillings and fourpence, being at the rate of forty pence the chalder. In 1288 twelve chalders of wheat brought twelve merks, or thirteen shillings and fourpence the chalder." (Tytler's History, vol. ii.)

[1] Robertson's Concilia, lxiii.

band of knights and yeomen, under the command of the Earls of Carrick and Athol, were despatched on the fatal expedition, few of whom ever returned. Athol died before Tunis, fighting bravely under the banners of the chivalrous but unfortunate St Lewis; and Carrick found a grave in Palestine. His widow married again, and became the mother of the heroic Bruce.

In the year 1275 Benemundus de Vicci, better known under the corrupted name of Bagimont, came to Scotland, to collect, on behalf of the Pope, the tenth of all ecclesiastical benefices for the recovery of the Holy Land—the grant to Henry having expired. It would appear, that long prior to this time there existed a valuation-roll of all our Church revenues, according to which the beneficed clergy were taxed, when procurations must be paid to legates, when suits must be appealed to Rome, when a proportion of the national burdens must be borne. The clergy wished the ancient valuation adhered to; but Bagimont had instructions to raise the tenths according to the true values of the benefices. As usual, there was an appeal, and Bagimont returned to Rome for fresh instructions; but the Pope was inexorable, and insisted that every benefice should be taxed according to its actual value at the time. Accordingly, a new valuation and assessment roll required to be formed, and this document was long known and hated in our country as Bagimont's Roll, till in process of time the actual valuation rose far above it, and then it was as much prized as it had been previously disliked. It was used at Rome as the rule of payment for those who came to seek benefices there. It still exists, but so mutilated, interpolated, and altered, as to give no information upon the real value of land or Church-livings prior to the reign of James V.

By far the most important political events in the reign of Alexander III. were the invasion of the Norwegians, their defeat at Largs, and the subsequent cession of the Hebrides to the crown of Scotland upon the payment of 4000 merks. But this acquisition of islands, long disputed, had for the time little influence upon ecclesiastical affairs; for though the patronage of the Bishopric of Sodor was ceded to Alexander, the ecclesiastical jurisdiction was reserved to the Archbishop of Drontheim in Norway; and so Iona still continued under the spiritual supremacy of the north.[1]

It was during the reign of the two Alexanders that the

---

[1] Tytler's Hist., vol. i., note.

different orders of mendicant friars first began to appear in Scotland. They were now at the very height of their popularity; and our monarchs, who gave them welcome, probably thought they would be more cheaply lodged and entertained than the expensive orders of Cistercian and Cluniac monks patronized by their predecessors. The chief agent in bringing them to this country was William de Malvoisin, Bishop of St Andrews, who was one of the most active and enterprising prelates of the time; and yet it appears he must have loved good cheer, for from 1202 to 1233 he deprived the Abbey of Dunfermline of the presentation to two churches, because its monks had neglected to supply him with wine enough for his collation after supper.[1]

We have now arrived at a period when Scottish ecclesiastics begin to make a prominent figure in the current literature of Europe. Dempster has written the biographies of more than twelve hundred eminent Scotch writers who lived from the fourth century downwards. It may be safely said that hundreds of these never existed, that hundreds more owed their birth to other countries than ours, and that of the remnant, the fame and the works of the majority have utterly perished. Our catalogue of authors, by this process of unbelief and forgetfulness, will be greatly reduced; but it will contain men, and not phantoms. We might well be proud to rank among our illustrious writers such men as Columbanus, Alcuin, and Rabanus Maurus; but other countries deny us the honour. Even Joannes Scotus Erigena, the friend and companion of Charles the Bald, and one of the most learned men of the ninth century, must be consigned to the limbo of uncertainty; for though it is certain he was a Scot, it is doubtful whether he was a Scot of Ireland, of Ayr, or of Strathearn.[2]

Michael Scot of Balwirie is still remembered in the traditions of the country, and is now embalmed in the Lay of the Last Minstrel. By visiting the great universities of England, France, Spain, and Italy, he made himself master of the dialectics and natural philosophy of the age. He was made a Doctor of Theology, and acquired for himself the name of Michael the Mathematician. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle, and a book concerning the physiognomy and procreation of men; but a large part of his time was devoted to alchemy and astrology. He was astrologer for a while to the Emperor Frederic II. When war drove him from his court,

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. i.

[2] Mackenzie's Lives, vol. i.

he found a welcome from the first Edward of England; and his old age appears to have been spent in his native land. It has been his fate to be remembered as a sorcerer rather than as a man of science. Dante, in his "Divine Comedy," makes mention of him as a magician. Dempster tells us that he had heard in his youth that the magic books of Michael Scot were still somewhere in existence, but might not be opened on account of the fiends that would thereby be let loose. Sir Walter Scott, the great Modern Wizard of the North, has adhered to the tradition of the country, that his books were interred in his grave. Yet let us not despise or condemn the Baron of Balwirie, though an ignorant age regarded him as a sorcerer, and undying poetry preserves the tradition. It was the doom of science in those dark days to be looked upon as necromancy; and the power over nature, which a slight acquaintance with its laws conferred, gave rise to the suspicion of dealings with the devil. Michael Scot flourished in the thirteenth century, and appears to have been one of the commissioners sent to bring the Maid of Norway to Scotland upon the death of Alexander III.[1]

John Holybush, known in the world of letters by the more sounding appellative of Joannes Sacrobosco, is said to owe his birth to Nithsdale. While still a young man he became a canon-regular of the order of St Augustine, and afterwards was made Professor of Mathematics in the University of Paris. He is acknowledged to have been the most learned mathematician of his day, and to have done much to revive in Europe a love for mathematical studies. His treatise on the Sphere was judged by Peter Ramus, Clavius, and Melancthon to be worthy of their study and illustrative comments. He was buried in the Church of the Mathurines at Paris, with his epitaph written round about a sphere, in allusion to his greatest work.[2] Richard, Abbot of St Victore, who flourished toward the end of the twelfth century, also owed his origin to Scotland. He devoted himself chiefly to exegetical and doctrinal studies, and has left behind him thirty-seven different treatises on theological subjects, which are still to be found in the libraries of the learned in two large folio volumes. Adam Scot, a canon-regular of the order of Premontre, was another of our northern lights in that remote age. With the wandering

---

[1] Note to the Lay of the Last Minstrel. Mackenzie's Lives, &c., &c.

[2] Mackenzie, Dempster, &c.

spirit which has always been characteristic of his countrymen, he went to France, where he rose to a distinction which he would have sought for in vain at home. He wrote a treatise on the Tabernacle of Moses, and another on the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; and excelled in the allegorical and mystical interpretation of Scripture, which was greatly applauded then, but would be accounted as worse than meaningless now.[1]

Thomas Learmont, generally known as Thomas the Rhymer, has obtained a more imperishable place in Scottish history than many who have a higher claim to it. He lived in the thirteenth century, and Ercildoun, a village not far from the Tweed, is famed as his birthplace and residence. He sustained the double character of a poet and prophet—characters once inseparable, but now disjoined through the decay of the spirit of prophecy; so that for nearly two thousand years our poets have been but poets, with no inspiration but that of genius. He is the author of "Sir Tristem," and is said to have foretold the death of Alexander III., the triumph of the Bruce, and the accession of the Stuarts to the throne; and there are still extant some obscure verses, in which the two last of these events are dimly foreshadowed; but doubts have been started in regard to their authorship. Some have affirmed that he derived his knowledge of the future from an inspired nun in the convent at Haddington; but the popular belief was, that he derived it from a secret intercourse with fairyland, whither he had been carried when a child. We shall probably stumble at both these hypotheses, and reject altogether his pretensions as a prophet; and his rhymes which remain do not give us very exalted ideas of his powers as a poet.

But by far the most celebrated Scotchman of the thirteenth century was the celebrated schoolman, John Duns Scotus. Born at Duns, in the Merse,[2] he entered at an early age the order of Franciscan Friars. To complete his studies he repaired to Oxford, where he rapidly rose to be professor of theology, and such was the fame of his genius and learning, that thirty thousand students are said to have resorted to his lectures; but we are not informed how the huge concourse

---

[1] Mackenzie, Dempster, &c.

[2] Some antiquaries have affirmed that this great schoolman was born at Dunstan in Northumberland; but there is a great preponderance of evidence in favour of Scotland. He is said to have been born in 1274, and to have died in 1308.

was accommodated. From Oxford he went to Paris, as a wider field for his talents. The scholastic philosophy was now in the ascendant; Aristotle was worshipped as a God, and every theological subject was reduced into a dialectic form, and discussed according to the rules of the dialectic art. Duns Scotus was deeply infected with the prevailing epidemic, and among his other works we find Commentaries on the Eight Books of Aristotle, and on the Four Books of Sentences. He ventured, however, in many particulars to differ from Aquinas, who, next to Aristotle, was the great authority of the day. The Dominicans flew to the succour of the one, the Franciscans stood fast by the side of the other. The famous sects of the Thomists and Scotists arose, whose controversies regarding Grace and Free Will are undecided to this day. The genius of Aquinas had earned for him the title of the *Angelic Doctor;* the acuteness of Scotus got for him the title of the *Subtle Doctor;* it was the fashion of the time to bestow such appellatives. But perhaps the greatest achievement of our countryman was connected with the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, a dogma which he is reputed to have proved to the satisfaction of the University of Paris by no fewer than two hundred arguments. Though his labours were abundant, his years were not many, for he is understood to have died at Cologne at the early age of thirty-four. Over his tomb, in the Church of the Minorites, it is said that there was once an epitaph, purporting that Scotland gave him birth, England nurture, France education, Germany a grave.[1]

We have been diverted from following the course of events by this brief review of the writers produced by our country in the thirteenth century, and who walk first in that long procession of poets, philosophers, and divines, which slowly defiles before the eye of the historian as he scans the centuries which succeed. We now return to our narrative.

Alexander III. was killed by a fall from his horse near Kinghorn on the 16th of March 1285-6. His death plunged the whole nation into mourning. "The nobility, clergy, and, above all, the gentry and commons," says Balfour, "bedewed his coffin for seventeen days' space with rivulets of tears." He was a good king, and deserved to be lamented. "In his time," to quote the affectionate tribute of Fordun, "the Church flourished; its ministers were treated with reverence; vice

---

[1] Scotia me genuit, Anglia suscepit,
Gallia edocuit, Germania tenet.

was openly discouraged; cunning and treachery were trampled under foot; injury ceased; and the reign of virtue, truth, and justice was maintained throughout the land." But, indeed, there was greater reason to grieve for the living than for the dead, because of the phials of wrath, confusion, and civil war which were now about to be poured out upon the country. Alexander had seen all his children die before him; and now the heir of his crown was an infant grandchild, daughter of Eric, King of Norway. Several of the powerful barons began already to aspire to the throne; and, in truth, in those turbulent times, a sickly child was scarcely its proper occupant. Edward of England had already reduced Wales, and had long been ambitious to annex Scotland to his crown; and he thought that now the pear was ripe. He proposed a marriage between the Maid of Norway and his son, which was agreed to; but the fragile girl died at Orkney on her voyage to Scotland, and so this scheme of ambition was blasted.

No fewer than twelve competitors for the throne now appeared; and, unhappily, Edward was chosen to adjudicate between them. Before proceeding to investigate their claims and give his award, the English monarch demanded that he should be recognised as Lord Paramount; and the demand, haughtily made, was meanly conceded by suitors anxious to secure the favour of their judge. Robert de Bruce and John de Baliol had undoubtedly the strongest claims; and Edward, discovering that the latter was likely to be the more compliant vassal, gave judgment in his favour. But even Baliol could not brook the indignities which were heaped upon him. He fired, and prepared to resist; but resentment was useless and resistance in vain in the divided state of the kingdom, and the feeble monarch was tumbled from his throne. At this crisis in the country's fate, William Wallace arose, and for a time almost single-handed stemmed the tide of oppression. He defeated the English at Stirling Bridge, and carried his victorious arms into the north of England; but the disaster at Falkirk, and the jealousy of the great barons, compelled him to resign his office of Governor of Scotland. Still he did not sheath his renowned two-handed sword; and Edward felt that so long as Wallace lived Scotland was not subdued.

The English monarch was not allowed to urge his pretensions to the feudal superiority of Scotland without a rival. Boniface VIII., in the year 1300, published a bull, in which he declared that Scotland was a fief of the Holy See,—and

commanded Edward to remove his officers and armies from the patrimony of the Church. One of the arguments by which His Holiness supported his pretensions was, that the spiritual conquest of the country had been achieved by the bones of St Andrew, the brother of St Peter.[1] One is tempted to think that the pretensions of the Pope were merely meant as a mockery of those of the King—a quiet sarcasm upon the weak arguments by which he supported his too powerful arms; but both were really in earnest. It is not improbable, however, that Scottish influence, perhaps Scottish gold, had procured the interference of the Supreme Pontiff; and it may even have been suggested that our bleeding country would be safest from the English lion if taken under the ample folds of the papal mantle. Edward received the bull with oaths and rage; but, collecting himself, he gave a courteous reply to the Archbishop of Canterbury who delivered it, and finally got his parliament to send an elaborate answer to the Pope in defence of his pretended rights. It is probable the document was accompanied with larger bribes than Scotland could afford; for His Holiness now suddenly turned round, and in a papal bull censured the patriotism of the Scottish bishops, who were anxious to maintain the independence of their country.[2]

Reconciled to Rome, and backed by this bull, Edward again marched into Scotland. "In recording the history of this last miserable campaign," says Tytler, with more than his usual eloquence, "the historian has to tell a tale of sullen submission and pitiless ravage; he has little to do but to follow in dejection the chariot-wheels of the conqueror, and to hear them crushing under their iron weight all that was free and brave in a devoted country."[3] But the cause of that country was not yet utterly lost; and its deliverer was already riding in hot-haste from the court of Edward for the Scottish border.

Robert Bruce, the grandson of Baliol's rival for the throne, had hitherto preserved his large estates by maintaining his allegiance to the English throne; but finding himself suspected, and no longer safe, he now fled to Scotland, summoned together his dependents and friends, had himself solemnly crowned at Scone, and, after some of the most romantic adventures, and hair-breadth escapes, and chivalrous feats at arms recorded in history, he achieved, on the field of Bannockburn, the independence of his country.

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. ii. Tytler's History, vol. i.

[2] Hailes's Annals, vol. ii.

[3] Tytler's History, vol ii.

Religion, though she naturally seeks for quieter scenes than the camp and the battle-field, did not altogether stand aloof in this great struggle for liberty. Among the first friends of the Bruce were Lamberton, Bishop of St Andrews; Wishart, Bishop of Glasgow; David, Bishop of Moray; and the Abbot of Scone. Bruce had become guilty of the most daring impiety by slaying Comyn in the Church of the Minorites at Dumfries; but Wishart absolved him in his cathedral at Glasgow. A papal excommunication was thundered against him, which might have utterly ruined him in that superstitious age, but the friendship and influence of Lamberton deprived it of more than half its power. Both these prelates paid for their patriotism by a long imprisonment, and it was only their surplice that saved them from a halter. The Bishop of Moray, undeterred, boldly preached in his diocese, that it was more meritorious to fight under the banners of Bruce than to join in a crusade against the Saracens. Led by such influence, the Scottish clergy met in a provincial council, and issued a declaration addressed to all the faithful, and bearing that the nation, seeing the kingdom betrayed and enslaved, had assumed Robert Bruce for its king, and that the clergy had cheerfully done him homage as such.[1] On the field of Bannockburn, before the battle, the Abbot of Inchaffray passed along the serried ranks of the Scots, bearing the bones of St Fillan, granting absolution, and fortifying courage by the powers of superstition. In gratitude to St Andrew, to whose assistance the victory was devoutly ascribed, the king gave to the canons of his cathedral a yearly sum of a hundred merks; Lamberton added the churches of Abercrombie and Dairsie; and Duncan, Earl of Fife, the church of Kilgour.[2]

A.D. 1317.

While the Church thus exhibited its patriotism, and the king his piety, the supremacy which a dominant priest had obtained among the nations was employed to prevent the Scottish armies from reaping the full fruits of victory. After the battle of Bannockburn, Bruce was bent upon following up his success by marching into England; and Edward was in no position to resist. It was resolved that the invaders should be combated with spiritual weapons. England was rich, and the Pope was compliant; and a bull was issued from Avignon, commanding a truce of two years between the hostile countries, under pain of the highest

---

[1] Hailes's Annals, vol. ii.

[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. i.

spiritual censures. Two cardinal legates were despatched to publish the truce, and in case of resistance to excommunicate the king. The cardinals prudently paused in England, and sent forward two nuncios to intimate the message; but the unfortunate deputies, while crossing the borders, were attacked by banditti, and being eased of some superfluous vestments and money, were allowed to pursue their way. Bruce courteously received them at court, professed his earnest desire to be at peace with his spiritual mother, but firmly refused to open the sealed letters which they brought, as they were not addressed to him under the title of king. "There are several nobles in my dominions," said he, "called Robert de Bruce; it may be they are intended for some one of them." [1]

Baffled of their object by the firmness of the king, the nuncios returned in all haste to the cardinals, who awaited the result of the enterprise at Durham. A check had been given to papal presumption; but it was never the wont of churchmen thus easily to quit the field. It was resolved that the truce should be published; and Adam Newton, a Franciscan friar, was employed upon the perilous mission. Setting out from Berwick, he found the king encamped in a wood near to Old Cambus, busily employed in constructing engines to batter the walls of the town he had just left. He sought, but was refused admittance to the royal presence; and when it was found that his credentials were not addressed to Robert as king, they were contemptuously returned to him unopened. The friar, nevertheless, with the devoted courage which has in general been characteristic of his order, proclaimed, in presence of a concourse of the barons, that it was the pontifical will there should be a truce between the kingdoms; but the words were no sooner spoken than there were mutterings and looks which could not be mistaken; and the monk, feeling his courage to ooze out, begged that he might now be allowed to proceed to visit the prelates, to whom his instructions were addressed; or, if not, that he might have a safe conduct to return to Berwick. Both requests were refused, and a hint conveyed that he had better leave the kingdom as quickly and as best he could. He took the hint and hastened south, but he was waylaid upon the road, robbed of his parchments, among which were the bulls excommunicating the king; and being further stripped of the little clothing which a Franciscan has, was left stark

---

[1] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. iii. pp. 661-2.

naked, and almost stark mad, to continue his journey. Arriving at Berwick, the unhappy monk addressed a letter to the legates bemoaning his misfortunes, and stating that it was rumoured that the Lord Robert had planned the robbery and was in possession of the parchments; and, without greatly wronging the memory of the pious monarch, we may feel disposed to believe in the report.[1]

A.D. 1320. After obtaining possession of Berwick, and repulsing an attempt to recapture it by the English king in person, and sweeping, more than once, the northern counties with his light-armed cavalry, Bruce consented to a cessation of hostilities. He was anxious not merely for the blessings of peace, but to be reconciled to the Holy See; but the Supreme Pontiff was in no humour to be reconciled to him, and had forgotten altogether his office as a peacemaker. A rabid and most rancorous bull was issued against the king and his accomplices; and the Archbishop of York, with the Bishops of London and Carlisle, were commanded, with all the usual solemnities of book, bell, and candle, to excommunicate the guilty crew every Sunday and festival-day throughout the year. This could not be borne in silence; and, accordingly, a meeting of the Estates was held at Aberbrothock, and an elaborate manifesto prepared and addressed to the Pope; setting forth the ancient independence of the nation, and the right of Robert the Bruce to reign as its king. It ran in the name of eight earls and thirty-one barons especially mentioned, and of "the other barons, freeholders, and whole community of Scotland."[2] The publication of this spirited manifesto led the Pontiff to sist the repeated publication of the bulls of excommunication; but it was not till three years afterwards, during which the northern counties of England were again cruelly wasted, that a complete reconciliation with Rome was effected by Randolph proceeding to Rome and persuading the Pope to address a bull to the Bruce, with the title of king. Edward complained of the bad faith of His Holiness for consenting to do so, but was soon afterwards himself glad to make peace with the Scottish monarch upon terms still more hurtful to his pride.

In all these transactions the patriotism and loyalty of the

---

[1] Rymer, Fœdera, vol. iii. pp. 683-4.

[2] A duplicate of this memorable document is preserved in the General Register House at Edinburgh. A facsimile is given in the first volume of the Scots Acts.

native clergy were sufficiently obvious, and it was only the foreign element—the unfortunately-recognised supremacy of the Bishop of Rome—that threatened to breed disturbance between the Church and the State. The papal court, ever venal, was at the service of England, and, of course, it had its emissaries and devotees; but the clergy, as a body, clung to the interests of the royal Bruce, and were ready to forget their vows to advance his cause. In truth, though the faith and worship of the Scottish Church were as corrupted as those of any Church in Christendom, its priesthood was never blindly submissive to the Vatican. The country was distant from the centre of pontifical influence, and much of that influence was lost as it radiated towards the circumference. It formed one of the outer provinces of the vast spiritual hierarchy, where the law in its rigour was not felt. Scotland was more than once put under an interdict, and its monarchs were frequently under the ban of the Holy See; but the king and the country alike seemed to have been unscathed by the lightning's flash, for we read of no rebellions, no assassinations, no outrages of any kind; and though history has recorded the facts, she has made no mention of their effects, from which we may infer that they were but slight and transient.

Our great king, notwithstanding his stout resistance to Rome, was a religious man according to the religion of the time; and there is a circumstance in his life, or rather connected with his death, which very well illustrates the religious feelings of the period. The blood of the Red Comyn, slain before the altar at Dumfries, had left a stain upon his conscience, and to wipe it out, he had solemnly vowed that when the country was free, he would take the cross and go to Palestine. He had never been able to perform his vow, and when he was upon his death-bed, being troubled thereat, he called Sir James Douglas to his side, and exacted from him a solemn promise, that when he was dead he would take out his heart and carry it to the Holy Sepulchre, "where the Lord lay."[1] The promise being made on the true faith of a knight, the monarch died in peace. The good Sir James was true to his word, and with a chosen band of knights set out for Palestine; but his unconquerable love for adventure led him

---

[1] Bruce had previously arranged that he should be buried at Melrose, to which abbey he bequeathed large sums; and it appears that it was not till he lay a poor leper at Cardross, and nigh to death, that he formed the resolution of sending his heart to Jerusalem.

to Spain, that he might assist in battle against the Moors, and being surrounded in the too eager pursuit of the flying foe, he made his last charge by throwing the casket containing the embalmed heart of his beloved sovereign before him, and crying out, "On, thou noble heart, and where the Bruce leads, the Douglas will follow!" The incident is one of the finest in the records of chivalry, but it is evidently embellished by romance.

Robert I. was succeeded by his son David II., a child of eight years old at the time of his father's death. In the rejoicings attending his birth, the court poets foretold that he would rival his father's fame; but virtue and valour are not always hereditary, and we read with extreme pain, on the prosaic but truthful page of history, of his mean and truckling spirit, and of how he would have sold to England for money the country which his father had redeemed with blood. Robert II., the first of the Stuarts who sat upon our throne, succeeded to his uncle David; and he in his turn was succeeded by his son Robert III. These reigns fill up the fourteenth century. They contain political events of the greatest importance, but no ecclesiastical occurrences deserving of record. The Church had now fully asserted its independence of England. The ecclesiastical battle was fought and won earlier than the political one. It was now completely conformed to Rome, and reconciled to Rome; and its bishops and priests quietly performed their sacred offices in those noble edifices which piety had reared for them. It is, unfortunately, only times of trouble that find a place in history; the calm scenes and useful labours of periods of repose soon sink into oblivion.

The seeds of our glorious modern literature were already beginning to germinate under the sunny influences of the Italian sky. In our colder latitudes the development was later and slower; but even in the fourteenth century there were evidences of a quickening power at work. We have authors in that age—all of them ecclesiastics—of whom we need not be ashamed.

John de Fordun is the earliest Scottish historian. He was born, toward the latter end of the reign of Alexander III., at Fordun in Kincardineshire. After he had finished his studies in grammar and philosophy, he applied himself to theology, and entered into holy orders. He formed the design of writing the history of his country from the most remote antiquity down to his own time, but he did not live to complete

the work. He finished only five books, but he has had several continuators. He was not free from the love for fable, universal in his age, and he traces our nation through Greece and Egypt up to Nimrod the mighty hunter. But when he leaves behind him the region of clouds, and sets his foot upon the solid land, he is in general worthy of credit ; and every subsequent historian has been largely indebted to him. He is, at least, the highest authority we have, and far more trustworthy than the imaginative Boece ; but none of our early chronicles can be implicitly followed as a guide. His "Scoti-Chronicon" was anciently so hightly esteemed, that almost every monastic library could boast a copy of it ; and the famous Register of the Carthusians at Perth, and the Black Books of Scone and Paisley, were little else than transcripts and continuations of it.

Achilles had Homer to celebrate his praise in immortal verse ; Bruce, a mightier hero, had a meaner bard, but still one of those favoured few who are born with a harp in their bosom. John Barbour is said to have been born in Aberdeen about the year 1316. After receiving the rudiments of his education at home, he pursued his philosophical and theological studies in the universities of Oxford and Paris. Returning to his native country, he entered into priest's orders, and was preferred by King David to the Archdeaconry of his native city. His heroic poem on Robert Bruce consists of a hundred and one books, in which he minutely traces his history, from his flight to Scotland down to the adventure of his heart on the mountains of Andalusia. It is a remarkable production for so early a period, giving us life-like pictures of the great characters who wrought out the deliverance of the country, and of the stirring scenes amid which they lived ; and though not to be ranked with the great productions of poetic genius, it must ever be interesting to Scotsmen as one of the earliest specimens of their native tongue, and the most faithful history of their favourite king.

John Bassol, a Minorite friar, who wrote a large folio on the "Books of the Sentences," which acquired for him the title of "the most orderly doctor ;" John Blair, a Benedictine monk, who is said to have been a schoolfellow of Sir William Wallace, and who afterwards wrote his deeds ; William Dempster, Professor of Philosophy at Paris ; and Thomas Varoye, Provost of Bothwell, who wrote a poem in celebration

of the battle of Otterburne, nearly complete the catalogue of illustrious Scotsmen in the fourteenth century. Even these, how few have seen their writings—how few have heard their names! But the revival of letters had already begun. Petrarch and Boccaccio had made the world vocal with poetry not unworthy of their Latin ancestry; the invention of printing was at hand; and greater men arose to play their parts upon a greater stage.

CHAPTER VII.

"ROME was not built in a day." This is equally true of papal as of pagan Rome. We shall sin against all history if we conceive that the stupendous system of faith and worship now embodied in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent was fully developed and perfect from the first. It was the growth of fifteen hundred years. The members of the hierarchy rose by slow decrees to their opulence and power; the rites and ceremonies which overlaid the spiritual services of the sanctuary were gradually introduced; and almost every important dogma was the subject of free discussion for centuries before it was put into the creed, and made a necessary article of belief. Pictures and statues were very early brought into the Christian churches, but it was not till the year 879 that the Council of Constantinople decreed the worship of images, and silenced the iconoclasts; and more than another century was required to make the doctrine universal in the west. From the patristic age the virtues of celibacy were greatly lauded, and multitudes of the clergy and laity, of men and of women, sacrificed the first instincts of their nature to the prevalent ideas of Christian perfection; but it was not till the eleventh century that Gregory VII. made celibacy compulsory upon every member of the sacerdotal caste. In the writings of several of the first apologists for Christianity there is language which seems to imply a belief in the real presence in the sacrament of the Supper: but not till the thirteenth century, when Innocent III. sat in the papal chair, was the term transubstantiation known, or the doctrine authoritatively defined. It was the same pontiff who first rendered auricular confession imperative, thus giving to the Church two dogmas,

the former of which is the greatest possible affront to the human understanding, and the latter the greatest possible shock to private modesty and to public morals. His successor, Honorius III., decreed the adoration of the Host, and thus rendered complete the idea of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Thus has this great Church system grown, and thus is it now growing; for it is a mistake to suppose that the creed of Rome is a sealed book, from which nothing must be taken away, and to which nothing may be added. In our own day, after five hundred years of vehement debate, the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibilty of the Pope have been placed upon the same level as the doctrines of the Existence and Unity of God.

It has frequently been remarked of the British constitution that its great strength and durability result from its being the slow growth of many centuries. In France we have seen constitutions born in a day and die in a day. In England the overshadowing constitution under which we live and are safe has been the work of nearly a thousand years—the product of a cautious legislation, meeting emergencies and correcting abuses just as they arose. Unlike the gourd matured by a single sun and blasted in a single night, it is more like the oak of our forests, which requires an unknown number of centuries to arrive at its fullest development; but which, when it has taken hold of the soil, no tempest can overturn. It is to the same circumstance we must attribute the amazing stability of the papal system and the papal power. The oldest empires are young in comparison with the spiritual empire of Rome. The most ancient dynasties are of yesterday contrasted with the long line of pontiffs who have sat in the chair of St Peter. Nor are there yet the slightest symptoms of this dominion coming to an end; for though old provinces have revolted and declared themselves free, new provinces have been gained which more than compensate for the loss; just as Great Britain has more than made up for the loss of the American States, by her vast and recently-acquired possessions in Australia and India.

The Church grew in Scotland as it grew at Rome, as the branch grows with the growth of the stem. Rite after rite was introduced; doctrine after doctrine was readily embraced; for with the expansion of the creed there was always exhibited a corresponding expansion of the faculty of faith; swarm after swarm of idle friars came from the south, dark-

ening the sky and settling down upon the land; stone after stone was added to the structure, and as it rose toward heaven, it appeared so broad and high, and firmly compacted, that nothing could shake it. But already the cloud, no larger than a man's hand, appeared in the sky, which betokened the coming tempest.

The fifteenth century opened upon one of the worst schisms that had ever rent the Latin Church. Boniface IX. at Rome, and Benedict XIII. at Avignon, both laid claim to the popedom, and exercised its functions. The death of the former did not end the division, for his faction raised to the pontificate Innocent VII.; and he, after a reign of two years, was succeeded by Gregory XII. A plan of reconciliation was now formed between the contending pontiffs, who reciprocally bound themselves by a solemn oath to resign the papal dignity, if necessary for the peace and welfare of the Church; but their oaths were violated, and the schism continued. In 1409 a Council was assembled at Pisa, which declared both the Popes to be guilty of heresy, perjury, and contumacy, and to be therefore *ipso facto* deposed and excommunicated. The Council next raised to the pontifical chair Peter of Candia, who assumed the name of Alexander V. There were now in the Church three factions and three Popes, who mutually cursed and excommunicated each other. Alexander V. dying at Bologna, sixteen cardinals, who belonged to his party, chose as his successor a Neapolitan, of a most unprincipled and profligate character, who took the name of John XXIII. The pious beheld all this with wonder and disgust, and knew not whom to recognise as their spiritual father and supreme head.

In 1414 the famous Council of Constance met to heal the divisions which distracted the Church. The Council began its labours by declaring, that an œcumenical council was superior to the Pope. This rule being established, John XXIII. was unanimously deposed on account of many grave crimes which were laid to his charge. As the Council was evidently in earnest, Gregory XII. anticipated his fate by making a voluntary resignation of the pontifical throne. But Benedict XIII. was not a man to yield, and so he also was deposed; and the field being thus cleared, Otta de Colonna was raised to the dignity of head of the Church, which he ruled under the title of Martin V. Still Benedict refused to acknowledge the proceedings of the Council, and continued till the day of

his death to claim the prerogatives and discharge the duties of the pontificate.

This unseemly spectacle of so many rival popes contending for the chair of the apostolic fisherman, with all the ambition, avarice, want of faith, and other crimes which the contest laid bare, scandalized many, and led them to doubt the infallibility of such men, and the purity of the Church over which they presided. But even before this period, Wickliff—so beautifully called the Morning Star of the Reformation—had arisen, and by his bold preaching, and, above all, by his translation of the Bible into English, exposed the corruptions of Rome. Notwithstanding the bitter enmity of the friars, whose profligacy he had frequently denounced, he died in peace at his rectory of Lutterworth in the year 1384. But a convocation of the Anglican clergy at Oxford, in 1410, condemned his doctrines, and burnt his books. The Council of Constance, after deposing so many popes, proceeded to deal with heretics. Huss and Jerome of Prague were consigned to the fire. Wicliff was happily beyond their power; but a list of propositions, culled from his writings, was examined and condemned, and a brutal decree passed, commanding his works, and his bones—now mouldering in the grave—to be committed to the flames. It was thirteen years before the decree was obeyed; but then his body was exhumed and burnt. "His ashes," says old Fuller, "were thrown into the Swift, and the Swift conveyed them to the Avon, the Avon into the Severn, the Severn into the narrow seas, the narrow seas into the main ocean; and, like his ashes, so were his doctrines dispersed over the wide world."

It is certain Wickliff had many followers. It was said that if you met two men upon the road, one of them was sure to be a Wickliffite.[1] Within thirty years of his death, his opinions had reached all the way to Bohemia; for Huss and Jerome had imbibed them, and it was for this chiefly they were condemned to be burnt. But even before the Council of Constance had met, the doctrines of Wickliff had found their way into Scotland. John Resby, an English priest, and described by our early historians as being of the school of Wickliff, had come into our country; and it was not long till he incurred the suspicion of heresy. He was accordingly seized, in the year 1407, and carried before a council of the clergy, over which presided Lawrence Lindores, a doctor in theology, and

---

[1] Knighton, De Eventibus.

a member of the Inquisition. His impeachment consisted of forty different articles, but we are acquainted with only two of them. He was accused of denying that the Pope was the successor of St Peter; or that a man of a wicked life could be the vicar of Christ. The trial resulted in his being condemned to the flames; and the cruel sentence was immediately carried into execution at Perth.[1] He was the first who went from Scotland to join the noble army of martyrs.

Scotland, at this period, was under the regency of Robert, Duke of Albany. The third Robert was dead, and his son, James I., was a captive in England. The whole aim of Albany was to maintain his precarious power, which he managed to do by pampering the nobles and ecclesiastics and oppressing the people. Winton, in his "Chronicle," specially celebrates his hatred of the Lollards, and his zeal for the purity of the Church.[2]

Henry Wardlaw was Bishop of St Andrews. We would willingly exculpate him if we could from all participation in the horrid crime. He was a prelate of liberal sentiments, of unbounded hospitality, distinguished for his anxiety to reform the clergy and the laity, and to him belongs the undying honour of having given to Scotland its first University. But it is impossible to believe that the fires of religious persecution could be kindled without the approbation of so influential a bishop. After all, need we wonder that he gave his voice to burn a wandering Wickliffite, when perhaps there were not ten men then living who did not think it was highly meritorious to persecute heretics to the death. The same sin lies at the door of still greater and holier men.

Wardlaw had got his bishopric from Benedict XIII., at Avignon; and he no sooner obtained possession of his See than he set his heart upon making it the seat of a University. Scottish munificence had already founded the Scotch College at Paris and Baliol College at Oxford; but Scotland itself was yet without any school for the higher branches of study, and its clergy were obliged to go abroad to complete their education. So early as 1410 the first Professors of St Andrews had begun their labours. John Shevez, Official of St Andrews, William Steven, afterwards Bishop of Dunblane, and Sir John Lister, a canon of the Abbey, read lectures in divinity; Lawrence Lindores expounded the common law; and Richard

---

[1] Fordun's Scotichron., lib. xv. c. 20.

[2] Winton's Chronicle, vol. ii. p. 419.

Cornwall, the civil law; while John Gow, William Foulis, and William Crosier, delivered prelections on philosophy and logic.[1] They are worthy to be held in everlasting remembrance, as the first *Senatus Academicus* of Scotland. The infant university was yet without endowments, and without a pontifical charter. The latter of these wants was speedily supplied. On the 3d February 1413, Alexander Ogilvy, who had been despatched to Rome to obtain the Pope's bull of confirmation, arrived at St Andrews, bringing with him the coveted document, and was received with every demonstration of joy. On the following day, the bull was read in the refectory, in the presence of the bishop and a large concourse of ecclesiastics. A procession, in which four hundred of the clergy joined, moved up the long nave of the cathedral to the altar; Te Deum was sung; high mass was celebrated; and the day was concluded with bonfires, the ringing of bells, and universal festivity.[2] It was fitting that thanks should be given to God, and that gladness should abound among the people, for science had how found a resting-place in the land.

In the year 1424 James I. was released from his captivity in England, and solemnly crowned in the abbey church of Scone. According to the ancient usage of the country, Murdoch, Duke of Albany and Earl of Fife, placed the crown upon his head; and Wardlaw, Bishop of St Andrews, anointed him with the holy oil. The country was in a state of perfect lawlessness; the barons were no better than powerful bandits; and to the poor for many long years had belonged only lamentation and woe; but there was now seated upon the throne a man of a determined will, resolved to redress such grievous wrongs. "Let God but grant me life," said he, "and there shall not be a spot in my dominions where the key shall not keep the castle, and the bracken-bush the cow, though I myself should lead the life of a dog to accomplish it."

The eyes of so wakeful a monarch were not shut to the abuses which had crept into the Church; but he required the help of churchmen to curb the exorbitant power of the nobles; and therefore he touched their sore places with a very tender hand, while otherwise he showed his zeal for the established religion. Buchanan celebrates his anxiety to raise the educational standard of the clergy, which was gradually sinking; and states that he gave instructions to the governors of all

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, book ii. Boethius, lib. xvi.

[2] Pinkerton's History, vol. i. Tytler's History, vol. iii.

schools, and of the university now happily founded, to make known to him any scholars who had distinguished themselves, that he might bestow upon them ecclesiastical preferments.[1]

The sale of Scotch benefices at Rome had long been felt as an intolerable evil. It not only impoverished the kingdom, but made the clergy look to a foreign potentate, instead of their own monarch, for promotion. Still further to extort money and render the higher ecclesiastics dependent upon the pontifical will, Pope Urban IV. had ordained that every bishop and abbot should repair to Rome for consecration; and, accordingly, towards the close of the thirteenth century, we find five of our bishops-elect dancing attendance at the Roman court for several years, while their bishoprics remained vacant at home. One of them died there, two received consecration, and one was refused, most probably because he could not afford bribes sufficiently large. The fifth, through his agent, obtained a mandate to be consecrated in Scotland.[2] This grasping at power and wealth on the part of the popes was felt over all Europe, and led to the memorable war of investitures. In Scotland the pretensions of the supreme pontiffs were not always, nor even generally, conceded. The bishops were generally elected by the cathedral chapters; the abbots by the monks; the parish priests by the native aristocracy, the bishops, or religious houses in which the patronage was vested. The popes were never denied the right of confirming the appointment, and the large fees consequent thereon. Still many of the best preferments were bestowed at Avignon or Rome, and it was the custom of aspiring clerks to resort thither in great numbers, to try what love or money could accomplish. Wardlaw was at Avignon with Benedict when the See of St Andrews became vacant, and managed to get the appointment. James I. resolved to put an end to this grievance; and, accordingly, had an act passed, declaring that no clerk should purchase any pension out of any benefice, secular or religious, "under all pain that he may tine against his Majesty."[3] By another act it was declared, that if any clerk wished to go beyond seas he must first prove to his ordinary that there was good cause for his journey, and make oath that he would not be guilty of *baratrie*,[4] a word which occurs in our ancient laws, and seems to be nearly synonimous with simony, or the purchasing of benefices by money. Certain acts, which had

---

[1] History, book x.

[2] Spottiswood, book ii.

[3] James I., parl. i. c. xiv.

[4] James I., parl. vii. c. cvii.

already been passed, anent carrying gold out of the realm, were also made applicable to churchmen proceeding to Rome with a suspicious amount of cash.

But while James thus attempted to check the avarice of the popes, in his very first parliament he ratified all the ancient privileges of the Church, and commanded all men to honour it.[1] He brought himself, however, into violent collision with the Roman See by parliamentary legislation which was thought to interfere with the spiritual jurisdiction of the Church, and saved himself from excommunication only by proposing a compromise. He was evidently bent on the reformation of the Church as well as the State. He ordered the bishop of St Andrews to take measures for recovering the possessions of which his See had been robbed by his predecessors: he ordered the Benedictines and Augustinians to restore their ancient discipline, and save themselves from ruin.[2] Unfortunately he proceeded still further. The death of Resby had not suppressed the opinions he cherished. So many had embraced them as to have attracted the attention and excited the alarm of the legislature. Accordingly, in a parliament held in 1425, it was enacted that every bishop within his diocese should make inquisition for all Lollards and heretics, in order that they might be punished, and that wherever it was necessary the secular arm should be called in to support the laws and authority of the Church.[3] Eight years elapsed after the passing of this act before we hear of its being put into force. But in the year 1433 it found a victim.

A.D. 1433.

A Bohemian of the name of Paul Craw had come from Prague to Scotland, for what reason is not very well known. He was a physician, but he appears to have been more zealous in propagating his religious opinions than in practising medicine. Lawrence Lindores, who had conducted the impeachment of Resby, again signalized his zeal for the Church by seizing Craw and arraigning him as a heretic. The Bohemian appears to have denied the doc-

---

[1] Most parliaments were opened by such an act. The first act of the first parliament of James was as follows :—"In the first to the honour of God and halie kirk, It is statute and ordained, that the halie kirk joyes and bruikis, and the ministers of it, thar auld priviledges and freedomes, And that no man let them to set thar lands or teinds under pain that may follow be spiritual law or temporal."

[2] Robertson's Concilia, Pref. lxxxviii.-xc.

[3] James I., parl. ii. chap. xxviii.

trine of transubstantiation, the existence of purgatory, the efficacy of absolution ; and to have maintained that the Bible, in the native tongue, should be open to all. It would also seem that in the celebration of the Supper, he and his followers observed a form not greatly different from that presently in use in Presbyterian Churches. The Lord's prayer was recited —the words of institution were read—and the elements of bread and wine given to the communicants. Craw was further accused of denying the resurrection of the dead, and encouraging gross immorality ; but in all probability these were the slanderous inventions of his enemies.[1] When put upon his trial he exhibited great acuteness and knowledge of the Scriptures ; but it was in vain. He was condemned and burnt at St Andrews.

A.D. 1435. Just a year before the tragic death of James I. Scotland received an illustrious visitor. Æneas Silvius, afterwards Pope Pius II., came to our country as papal legate, and has left us some interesting notices of its condition at the time. "Concerning Scotland," says he, "these things are worthy of repetition. It is an island joined to England, stretching two hundred miles to the north, and about fifty broad ; a cold country, fertile of few sorts of grain, and generally void of trees ; but there is a sulphureous stone dug up, which is used for firing. The towns are unwalled, the houses commonly built without lime, and in villages roofed with turf, while a cow's hide supplies the place of a door. The commonalty are poor and uneducated, have abundance of flesh and fish, but eat bread as a dainty. The men are small in stature, but bold ; the women fair and comely, and prone to the pleasures of love—kisses being there esteemed of less consequence than pressing the hand is in Italy. The wine is all imported ; the horses are mostly small, ambling nags, only a few being preserved entire for propagation, and neither curry-combs nor reins are used. The oysters are larger than in England. From Scotland are imported into Flanders hides, wool, salt-fish, and pearls. Nothing gives the Scots more pleasure than to hear the English dispraised. The country is divided into two parts,—the cultivated lowlands, and the region where agriculture is not used. The wild Scots have a different language, and sometimes eat the bark of trees." . . . . . "Coals are given to the poor at the church-doors by way of

---

[1] Fordun Scotichron., lib. xvi. c. 20. Tytler, vol. iii.

alms, the country being denuded of wood."[1] The future Pope informs us, that, on his return, when he reached the north of England, disguised as a merchant, he could get neither bread nor wine; and during the night, a report being spread that the Scottish borderers were approaching, the men fled, but the women remained quietly at home, undismayed by the prospect of the probable result.

A.D. 1436.

In 1436, James was basely assassinated in the convent of the Dominicans at Perth. He was perhaps the most energetic monarch who ever occupied our throne; and many of the laws passed during his reign prove his anxiety to promote trade and to ameliorate the condition of the poor. But it is probable that, had he lived, he would have completely crushed the nobility, and in freeing the country from their rapacity and turbulence, exposed it to the hazard of a monarchical despotism. His death brought upon the nation the evils of a long minority. His eldest son, James II., was but six years old when he was crowned king. There was now repeated the often-told tale of fierce contendings for place and power. Crichton struggled with Livingstone, and Livingstone with Crichton, for the supreme direction of affairs; and the unhappy royal child was carried about from place to place, to be used as a puppet—was captured and recaptured—was now a prisoner at Edinburgh, now at Stirling; while the house of Douglas appeared to overtop the very monarchy, like some huge tower overtopping the walls of a beleaguered city, and threatening its destruction. But this came to an end. Before James was arrived at manhood he seized the reins of government, and held them so firmly as soon to show that he had inherited some of the energy and resolution of his father.

Up to this time when a bishop died his personal estate went to the crown, probably on the theory that he could have no heirs proper to whom to leave it. The Church had frequently remonstrated against this but without success. But now in a parliament held in 1449 the bishops went down upon their knees before the king, and the ancient custom was revoked, and the prelates allowed to leave their money to whom they pleased.[2] At this period there were always some nephews or nieces whom the good bishops loved with an affection entirely paternal—what more natural than that they should wish to leave them their wealth?

---

[1] Pii II., Comment. rerum. mem. sui temporis.

[2] Act Parl. Scot., James II.

A.D. 1450.

In perusing the annals of this reign, so full of feuds, assassinations, and all the darkest passions of our nature, it is pleasing to light upon a page which records the erection of a second university. It is a gleam of sunshine in the midst of a tempest. On the 7th of January 1450, Pope Nicolas V. issued a bull for the erection of a *studium generale*, or University in Glasgow. It is to William Turnbull, the bishop of the diocese, that we are indebted for the boon; but the papal bull of erection proceeds upon the desire of the king, and the fitness of the city for producing the fruits of learning to the advantage of all Scotland and the neighbouring nations, "by reason of the salubrity of its climate, the plenty of victuals, and of everything necessary for the use of man; that there the Catholic faith may abound, the simple be instructed, justice taught, reason flourish, and the minds and understandings of men be enlightened and enlarged." In this foundation-charter it is further ordained, that the doctors, masters, lecturers, and students of the University of Glasgow should enjoy all the privileges granted by the Apostolic See to the University of the city of Bologna.[1] The papal bull was solemnly read at the market-cross; a plenary indulgence was promised to all who should visit the cathedral during the current year; and the University of the West began its career, obscure at first, but ever marking its track through time with a broader and brighter splendour.

The royal protection was soon extended to the infant seminary. On the 20th of April 1453, James II., by his royal letters, "took under his firm peace, protection, and safeguard, all and every the rector, deans of faculty, procurators of nations, regents, masters, and scholars, in the aforesaid university, and exempted them, together with the beadles, writers, stationers, parchment-makers, and students, from all tributes, services, exactions, taxations, collections, watchings, wardings, and all dues whatsoever imposed within the kingdom, or to be imposed."[2] In the same year Bishop Turnbull executed a deed, confirming and explaining the privileges granted by papal and royal favour to his university, and granting others, which show how much it was in the power of a bishop to grant. But though possessed of such high privileges, the university does not appear to have yet fallen heir to any property or endow

---

[1] Origines Parochiales Scotiæ—Glasgow.

[2] Origines—Glasgow. In this document James calls the university—"Alma Universitas Glasguensis, filia nostra dilecta."

ments, and must have resembled some of our ancient nobility in the seventeenth century, who, with illustrious titles and extensive hereditable jurisdictions, could scarcely muster enough of money to purchase a coat, or furnish themselves with a meal. "The university," says Professor Jardine, "came into the world as naked as every individual."

It found its first domicile in the Rottenrow, where there was a house known long afterwards as the "Aulde Pedagoge;" but on the 6th of June 1459, James Lord Hamilton bequeathed to the regent and students a tenement "in the street leading down from the cathedral to the market-cross, near the place of the Dominican Friars," together with four acres of land in the Dowhill, contiguous to the Molendinar Burn, upon condition that every day they should, in a prescribed form, pray for his own soul and the soul of Euphemia, his countess; and that if an oratory should ever be built within the college, the regent and students should there also daily convene, and, on their bended knees, sing an Ave to the Virgin, with a collect and memoria for himself and his wife.[1] Whether or not the regent and students were thus careful to remember Lord James and his lady in their prayers, the tenement was taken possession of, and it served to shelter the learning of the west, till it was thrown down, and the buildings were erected upon its site, which accommodated the University till a few years ago, when it moved westwards from the squalor of the High Street to the palatial structure which the munificence of the city merchants provided for it on Gilmore Hill. Three years later than Lord Hamilton's gift, David de Cadiou, Canon of Glasgow and Rector of the University, assigned an annual sum of twelve merks, from certain lands and tenements in the burgh, to endow a clerk in the faculty of the sacred canons, who should be bound to read lectures in the public schools within the city in the morning, and celebrate mass at the altar of the Virgin in the lower church of the cathedral, for the donor, his parents, friends, and benefactors.[2] In 1466 another tenement, adjoining that already obtained, was bequeathed to the university by Thomas Arthurlie. These were the first benefactors of this celebrated school; and though we may no longer say masses for their souls, it is right we should hold their names in grateful remembrance. Their example was not generally followed, and for a century and a half the University of Glasgow remained wretchedly poor.

In accordance with the papal bull, the university contained

---

[1] Origines—Glasgow.

[2] Ibid.

four different faculties—theology, canon law, civil law, and arts. We have no very explicit information in regard to the first professorships that were instituted, or the first lectures that were read. From its first institution the university enjoyed the privilege of conferring degrees. In order to the acquisition of one of these, a certain period required to be devoted to study within the university; certain prelections heard; Porphyrie's "Introduction to Aristotle," and "Petrus Hispanus" mastered; a searching examination endured; and then the chancellor or vice-chancellor bestowed the coveted academical honour, as by Divine authority, and in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.[1]

Within the first two years of its existence, upwards of a hundred persons were admitted members of the university, but these were chiefly Churchmen, ambitious of the honours and privileges of a learned corporation, and not young men commencing their studies. Among its earliest professors were John Major, David Melville, and John Adamson. Among its first students were William Manderstone, successively Rector of the University of Paris and St Andrews, Cardinal Beaton, John Knox, and John Spottiswood. But still earlier than these, and among the matriculated in 1451, was a William Elphinston. This youth afterwards rose to great distinction in the canon and civil law; he became Bishop of Aberdeen and Chancellor of the Kingdom, and showed his enlightened liberality by founding and endowing a university in his episcopal city. Thus is one lamp lighted at another.[2]

At this period the students ate at a common table, as is still the case in the great English universities. The regents sat at table with them and maintained order. At nine o'clock at night the gates of the college were shut, and the regents visited the rooms of the students to see that they were in bed; and again, at five in the morning, they went their rounds to see that they were astir. The universities were in many respects copies from monastic models. Many of the professors were monks, many of the students were designed to be monks, and the monasteries had hitherto accomplished imperfectly, what the universities were now intended to do in a more perfect way.

It would appear that the students in arts were distinguished,

---

[1] Statistical Account of the University of Glasgow, transmitted by Professor G. Jardine, in the name of the Principal and Professors of the University.—See Statistical Account of Scotland, 1799, vol. xxi.

[2] Statistical Account, &c. M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. i.

according to their rank, into the sons of noblemen, of gentlemen, and of those of humbler pedigree—distinctions which are now happily abolished in all the seats of learning in Scotland, where it is only superior genius or superior industry that can raise one student above his fellows. Among these youths, it was essential that discipline should be maintained, and as suasion frequently fails, corporal punishment might be inflicted ; and the statutes carefully provide, that in certain cases it should be administered *caligis laxatis*. But notwithstanding the rigour of its discipline, the university languished. It languished because it was poor. We hear complaints of masters not attending upon their duties, of licentiates not proceeding with their degrees, of statutes having fallen into disuse, and of the jurisdiction of the university being despised. The three higher faculties gradually died from inanition, and at the Reformation the faculty of arts alone gave some feeble symptoms of remaining vitality.[1] But we must now revert to our narrative.

The Second James followed the example of his father in resolving to hold the Church patronage of the kingdom in his own hands, to the exclusion of the Holy See ; and in this he was supported by the national clergy. During his reign, a provincial council was held at Perth, in which it was declared, that by the ancient law and custom of Scotland, the presentation to all vacant benefices, within a vacant bishopric, belonged to the Crown.[2] In all other matters the king and the clergy appear to have been bound to one another by mutual interests and mutual support ; and it is certain, that if the throne lost some of its strength by the alienation of its ancient demesnes to the Church, it was more than compensated by the assistance which the Church gave it in hours of need.

The chief friend and counsellor of James II. was Kennedy, who succeeded Wardlaw in the See of St Andrews. He was at once the greatest and the best man of his age. His portrait is one of the most prominent in the gloomy picture of the times, presenting a benign aspect amid many fierce and frowning visages. He was so much occupied with affairs of State, that one would think he must have neglected his episcopal duties, and yet we know that no prelate was more attentive to these. He is said to have visited every church in his diocese four times in the year, and to have been particularly careful in compelling every parson and vicar to reside

[1] Statistical Account, &c. [2] Tytler's History, vol. iv.

within his parish, to preach the Word, administer the sacraments, and visit the sick.[1] Robert Lindsay of Pitscottie gives an anecdote of him, which is illustrative at once of his patriotism and piety. The Earl of Douglas had entered into a conspiracy against the throne with some of the most powerful barons, and their adherents were already in arms. In this emergency the king hurried to St Andrews to take the advice of the bishop, whose fidelity and wisdom had already been so often tried. The good prelate first of all led his Majesty into his oratory, that together they might ask guidance from the Almighty Disposer of all events; and this being done, he next conducted him to his study, and put into his hand a bundle of arrows firmly bound together, and asked him to break them if he could. The monarch with all his strength was unable, upon which the bishop unbound them, and taking them singly easily snapped them all asunder. "Sir," said he, addressing the king, "you must even do in this manner with your barons." James understood the hint, and taking his directions still further from Kennedy, managed to dissolve the dangerous confederacy which had been formed against him, and to reduce the overgrown power of the Douglases.[2]

James was untimely killed at the siege of Roxburgh Castle, by the bursting of a cannon; and again were heard throughout the kingdom the doleful words, "Woe unto thee, O land, when thy king is a child." But Kennedy still lived, and managed as no other man could have done to keep down faction. In 1466 he died, and his death was felt to be a national calamity, for he left no one behind him capable of governing the kingdom with such integrity and discretion. "His death," says Buchanan, "was so lamented by all good men, as if in him they had lost a public father."

It is to this prelate we owe the foundation of St Salvator's College at St Andrews. He assigned also a large sum of money to erect a tomb for himself, which still remains, a monument of his wealth, and of a weakness from which, with all his virtues, he was not exempt. "He founded," says Lindsay, "a triumphant college at St Andrews, called St Salvator's College, wherein he made his lair very curiously and costly; and also, he bigged a ship called the Bishop's Berge; and when all three were complete, he knew not which of the three was costliest."[3]

---

[1] Lindsay's History, p. 69. [2] Ibid., pp. 52, 53.
[3] Ibid., p. 68.

Kennedy was succeeded in the See of St Andrews by Patrick Graham, his near relative. The learning and virtues of this ecclesiastic, not to speak of his royal birth, for he was nephew of James I. and grandson of Robert III., made him worthy of the high post he was called to fill. He had been elected by the canons, as was then usual, but he required the Pope's bull of confirmation to make his title complete. The Boyds, who now ruled the court and the kingdom, wished to prevent this, but he stealthily left the country and posted to Rome, where he found favour with the Pope, and got his election confirmed. Afraid to return home on account of the bitter animosity of the prevailing faction, he resolved to remain at the papal court till some change should occur among the parties in power. While there he managed to gain such influence with Sixtus IV., that he obtained a bull erecting St Andrews into an Archiepiscopal and Metropolitan See. The Pope, to give a still greater grace to the first archbishop whom Scotland had seen, appointed him apostolic nuncio, with full power to reform all abuses in the Church, and levy soldiers and subsidies for a crusade. Neville, Archbishop of York, remonstrated violently against this elevation of Graham as an infringement of his jurisdiction, but it was in vain.[1]

A.D. 1472. Scotland had now gained the honour which for several centuries she had ardently desired, as the primacy of York was most effectually barred by the primacy of St Andrews; and the spiritual independence of the kingdom was thus for ever secured. Graham rejoiced, and naturally thought that all good men would rejoice with him. As soon, therefore, as he heard that the Boyds had fallen from their high pinnacle of power, and that the young king had taken the government into his own hands, he hastened to return home, sending the papal bulls before him, that they might prepare his triumphal way. He had no sooner landed than he discovered his mistake. Envy of his fortunes and dread of his reforms had raised him up many enemies, who poisoned the ear of the king with insinuations that he had violated the law of the realm in leaving the kingdom, and carrying on negotiations with the papal court without the royal license. He was cited to answer for his conduct at Edinburgh, on the 1st of November. When put upon his trial, Graham appealed to his bulls, and pleaded the service he had rendered to his country; but his enemies appealed to the Pope, and

---

[1] Robertson's Concilia, Pref., cxii.

offered to prove the invalidity of the documents he presented. The king is said to have had his judgment swayed by a present of eleven thousand merks; and so he ordered Graham to retire to his bishopric, and refrain from wearing the archiepiscopal pall till the cause were determined.[1]

Conspicuous among the enemies of the new archbishop was one William Shevez, an able but unprincipled man, who had acquired great favour at court from his supposed acquaintance with the fashionable science of astrology. Through his intrigues the revenues of St Andrews were seized and confiscated by the king. The bankers of Rome, with whom Graham had got deeply involved, hearing of the trouble into which he had fallen, now became clamant, and the impoverished primate was unable to satisfy their demands. In these circumstances, a nuncio was despatched to Scotland to inquire into the case. It was affirmed that the archbishop spoke blasphemously against the Holy See, that he revoked its indulgences and spurned its censures, that he believed himself the Pope, appointed legates to different parts of the world, would celebrate mass three times in a day, and finally began to broach some horrible, but unreported heresies.[2] As the only explanation of these aberrations, it was said he was mad; but it is evident there was method in his madness, and even some gleams of sense, and it is just possible insanity may have been alleged to save the Church from the scandal of its metropolitan being a heretic. However this may be, he was degraded from his office, and committed to the keeping of his mortal enemy Shevez, who kept him a close prisoner, first at Inchcolm, and afterwards at Lochleven, where he died. Shevez managed to get himself appointed to the archbishopric in his place, founding his fortune on the ruin of a far better and worthier man.

Among the elements which conspired to the ruin of Graham, by uniting the king and the higher clergy against him, was the shameless huckstering in benefices which began at this period. The first two Jameses had prohibited the clergy from purchasing benefices at the court of Rome; but it was reserved for the third James to divert the stream of wealth which had hitherto flowed into the Pope's treasury, so that it might be poured into his own. Under his reign an act was passed forbidding the procuring of benefices at Rome, the collection of

---

[1] Buchanan, book xii. Spottiswood, book ii.

[2] Theiner's Vetera Monumenta, p. 480. Robertson's Concilia, Pref. cxvi.

more money for the Papal See than had been regulated by the ancient taxation of Bagimont, and confirming the right of the clergy to the election of their own dignitaries.[1] But in two years this law was violated by its maker. The monks of Dunfermline, according to ancient usuage, had chosen for themselves an abbot; but the king, probably won by a bribe, recommended another to the Pope for confirmation, and the Pope at once confirmed the royal nominee.[2] This was but the beginning of the system. Bishoprics, abbacies, priories, parishes, were now openly sold by the king and his favourites; and men of worthless character, and even laymen, were thus intruded into the office of the ministry. Patrick Graham was known to be opposed to such practices; and it was feared that when he was armed with primatial and legatine powers many Simonists would be thrown out, and the lucrative trade in benefices checked. This hastened his fall.

It is obvious that even already the king and his nobles began to grudge the Church its possessions. After this period no new abbeys were built, no new bishoprics endowed. But what had been given could not be regained. The Church was too strong for this; and had the monarch put forth his hand to touch her, she would have cursed him to his face. But an expedient was devised by which the Church retained her wealth, and the king and the barons enjoyed it. When a bishopric or priory became vacant, it was bestowed upon some friend, or sold for money, or given as the reward of services, which could not otherwise be so easily repaid. It is melancholy to mark the number of bastards—the illegitimate sons of nobles and kings—who became bishops and abbots after this period; and when there was no bastard—which was seldom the case—there was always a younger son, who, deprived by aristocratic pride of any share in the family property, received a richer inheritance in the patrimony of the Church. Such an exercise of patronage was necessarily followed by the decay of piety and devotedness among the clergy, especially among the regulars. It is probably to this cause we are to trace the rise of a new species of religious foundation, which belongs to this age—collegiate churches or provostries. According to the constitution of these, the secular canons formed a body at the college church, and employed themselves in singing masses for the founders, and performing other parts of divine service,

---

[1] James III., parl. i. chap. iv.; also, parl. vi. chap. xliv.

[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. i. Pinkerton, vol. i.

while vicars served their respective parishes. But still the sore evil spread. A mercenary spirit had been introduced into the Church. Money-changers had gained admittance to the temple ; and there was needed a reformer to overturn their tables, and drive them out with a scourge of cords.

In 1488 James III., a monarch of some accomplishments, but devoted to favourites of low birth, and too inactive to repress aristocratic turbulence—was assassinated by a pretended priest at Milltown, in fleeing from the civil strife of Sauchie. His son, James IV., a youth of sixteen, who cannot be acquitted of the unnatural crimes of treason and rebellion against his father, succeeded him on the throne. The young monarch afterwards repented bitterly the share he had in his father's death ; and whatever may have been his faults, he was certainly a most energetic and chivalrous prince, resembling in some respects James I.

During his reign Scotland was enriched with a third university. At the request of Bishop Elphinston, James IV. applied for a papal bull for the erection of a *studium generale* in Aberdeen. In his letter to the Pope, the king gives a melancholy picture of the state of the north country. "The inhabitants," he says, "are ignorant of letters, and almost uncivilised ; there are no persons to be found fit to preach the Word of God to the people, or to administer the sacraments of the Church ; and, besides, the country is so intersected with mountains and arms of the sea, so distant from universities already erected, and the roads so dangerous, that the youth have not access to the benefit of education in those seminaries." "But," adds the king, "the city of Old Aberdeen is situated at a moderate distance from the highland country and nothern islands, enjoys an excellent temperature of air, abundance of provisions, and the conveniency of habitation, and of everything necessary for human life." In compliance with the royal request, Pope Alexander VI. issued a bull in 1494 for erecting in the city of Aberdeen a *studium generale et universitas studii generalis* for theology, canon and civil law, medicine, the liberal arts, and every other lawful faculty ; ordaining that it should enjoy all the rights and privileges of the Universities of Bologna and Paris, and that the bishops of Aberdeen should in all time be its chancellors.

In 1497 James IV. granted a charter of confirmation, empowering Bishop Elphinston to erect a college within the university, and to divide its revenues between the masters and

scholars as he should see fit, according to the powers vested in him by the Pope. It was not till 1506 that this college was erected. It was dedicated to the Holy Virgin. It was to consist of thirty-six ordinary members, among the chief of whom were a doctor in each of the four faculties of theology, canon law, civil law, and medicine; the doctor of theology to be styled principal, and to bear rule over all the members of the college. Next to these came two masters of arts, the first of whom was to be called regent, and constituted sub-principal; the other was to be call grammarian, and his province was to consist in teaching the elements of literature. These were the permanent members of the college, and, with the exception of the mediciner, they were all to be ecclesiastics.[1] A chair of medicine was perfectly new to Scotland. Henceforward the science of healing was to be taken out of the hands of barbers and old wives, and entrusted to men of science.

Besides these permanent members, there were also a number of masters and bachelors of arts, who were to hold their situations only for a certain number of years; thirteen poor scholars of respectable talents and proficiency in the speculative sciences; and, last of all, eight prebendaries and six singing-boys for the service of the Church. For the accommodation of his learned society, the patriotic bishop, with the assistance of the king, erected the noble buildings which still remain as a monument of his liberality and taste. By donations during his life, and a legacy of ten thousand pounds bequeathed at his death, he endowed his college with a truly princely munificence; and thus the doctors were able to "prelect every lecture-day, each in his own faculty, and dressed in his own habit."[2]

The laws of this northern university give us no very favourable idea of student life in those early times. All, great and small, in the college are ordained to live honestly; they are prohibited from keeping public concubines, from carrying arms, from being night-walkers, panders, or vagabond buffoons; and are exhorted rather to devote themselves to good manners and liberal studies.[3] But a still greater scandal was brought

---

[1] Report of Commissioners on Scottish Universities, p. 305. Statistical Account of the University and King's College of Aberdeen, by the Members of the University. See Statistical Account of Scotland, 1799, vol. xxi.

[2] Statistical Account, *ut supra*.

[3] Report of Commissioners.

upon the ancient literature and universities of the country, by an Act of Parliament passed in 1599, which established a regular "ordour of punishment" for sorners, masterful beggars, and vagabonds. This act, after specifying jugglers, gypsies, fortune-tellers, idlers, minstrels, counterfeiters of licenses, mariners pretending they have been shipwrecked, proceeds to mention "all vagabond scholars of the Universities of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, not licensed by the rector and dean of faculty to ask almes." It is enacted and declared, that these shall be taken, esteemed, and punished as strong beggars and vagabonds.[1] It is comforting to know that the same reproach lies at the door of other and still more celebrated universities.

The first principal of King's College, Aberdeen, was Hector Boethius, who was honoured with the correspondence of Erasmus, and justly obtained a high reputation for his classical attainments and lively fancy. As a historian, however, he had too great a love for the marvellous, and could not refrain from inventing facts, and imbellishing those he did not require to invent with a garniture of his own. His "*Historiæ Scottorum*" is contained in seventeen books, beginning with Gathelus and Pharaoh, and ending with the death of James I. He closes his labours very characteristically, by telling of a sow that brought forth a dog, and of a cow that had a calf with the head of a horse. Yet, though not often quoted as an authority, he will long be remembered as one of the earliest of Scottish historians. His tomb, together with that of Bishop Elphinston, is in the chapel of the college so famous for its exquisite carvings in wood. The whole buildings are massive and imposing, and Billings has declared that there is no structure in Scotland which possesses more of a cloister-like repose.[2]

The fifteenth century witnessed the erection of three universities; and for all of them are we indebted to the Church. The building of cathedrals and abbeys had declined; the building of schools and colleges had commenced. It was a healthful and a hopeful sign. It spoke of a future illumined with learning. It augured a change in the Church, though the Church understood it not. The dawn of knowledge was the dawn of the Reformation. And while benevolent and enlightened prelates furnished the youth of Scotland with the means of obtaining at home a liberal education, the monarch resolved

---

[1] James VI., parl. vi. chap. lxxiv.

[2] Ecclesiastical and Baronial Antiquities of Scotland, vol. i.

that these means should not be furnished in vain. In the fifth parliament of James IV. it was statute and ordained that all barons and freeholders of substance should keep their eldest sons and heirs at school till they were taught Latin, philosophy, and the laws, under a penalty of twenty pounds. This short law speaks volumes.[1] A great change must have come over men's minds before it could have been imagined or passed: the learning which a century before would have been accounted degrading is here made compulsory. A new era had undoubtedly begun. The present compulsory system of education is, to some extent, only the revival of a law already on the statute-book.

A native literature was now beginning to push out its first buds. Andrew de Winton, prior of St Serf's monastery in Lochleven, published, about 1420, his rhyming Cronykil of Scotland, and though his poetic genius is inferior to that of Barbour (the earliest of our native bards), he has helped to form our language, besides giving an animated narrative of many important events. Forty years later Blind Harry wrote his Adventures of Sir William Wallace, a version of which, in modern Scotch, has been long popular with the Scotch peasantry, and is said to have first kindled the poetic genius of Burns. But even before this James I. had written the King's Quhair and Christes Kirk on the Grene. Thus native thought first appeared in a native garb.

It has frequently been maintained that the Scottish ecclesiastics of this period were scandalously ignorant and illiterate. It is certain they were unacquainted with sciences not then known; unread in books not then published; and that they were better versed in their missal than their Bible. But it will

---

[1] The design of this Act was to fit the sons of the gentry to act as local magistrates. It is curious enough to deserve transcription:—"It is statute and ordained throw all the realme, that all barronnes and freehalders that are of substance put their eldest sonnes and aires to the schule, fra they be six or nine zeires of age, and till remaine at the grammar-schules, quhill they be competently founded, and have perfite Latin; and thereafter to remaine three zeires at the schules of art and jure, swa that they have knowledge and understanding of the laws. Throw the quhilks justice may remaine universally throw all the realme; swa that they that are Sheriffes or Judges Ordinares, under the Kingis Hienesse, may have knowledge to do justice, that the puir people suld have na neede to seek our Soveraine Lordis Principal Auditour for ilk small injurie. And quhat barronne or freeholder of substance that holdes not his sonne at the schule, as guid is, havand na lauchfull essoinzie, but failzies herein, fra knawledge may be gotten thereof, he sall pay to the king the summe of twentie pound. (James IV., parl. v. chap. liv.)

be difficult to prove that they were either stupid or unlearned, when compared with the generation then existing, or tried by the standard then in use. Every important deed was drawn by their pens; every important office of State was in their hands; the schools were taught by them; the universities were founded by them. All the authors were still ecclesiastics; and though few of the productions of this period have come down to us, it must be remembered that much of what was then done has perished; and very probably, in three hundred years hence little more of the teeming authorship of the nineteenth century will be found still floating on the tide of time. It is monstrously unfair to blame the ancient priesthood for not having raised Europe all at once from Gothic barbarity. It is false to charge them with systematically trying to keep the people in ignorance. How could they teach a knowledge not yet known; communicate ideas not yet dreamt of; confer a civilisation which nowhere existed; compel haughty barons to enter their schools, who would thereby have considered themselves to be lowered to the level of monks? The old clergy laid the foundations of our civilisation and sciences, though another race reared the superstructure. Every new step in advance was taken by them; and they undoubtedly ever walked first of the men of their generation in that slow and painful progress which has led to the high and commanding eminence on which we now stand.

Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray, in the reign of James IV., has been cited as an instance of ignorance, and as a specimen of his class.[1] Forman was probably a poor Latinist, and his wit sometimes got the better of his piety; but he was one of the ablest diplomatist, if not one of the best prelates, of his day. When the armies of the Roman Pontiff and the French King were ready to come to blows, the Bishop of Moray managed to make peace. He was rewarded for his services by the Pope with the mule upon which his holiness rode, and by being made Legate of Scotland: he was rewarded by the king for this and other services connected with an invasion of England, by being made Archbishop of Bourges.[2] From this period he was constantly employed on embassages between the Scotch and French Courts; and on more occasions than one he was despatched to negotiate with the King of England.

---

[1] Among others, by Dr M'Crie, in his "Life of Knox," p. 12 (note).

[2] Lindsay, History, pp. 106-7. Burton's History, chap. 30.

The story upon which the belief in his ignorance is founded is this: When at Rome, he gave a banquet to the Pope and his cardinals. Required to say a Latin grace, the unexpected responses of the sacred company put him out, and he fairly broke down. Instantly recovering himself, however, he mumbled, in his own vernacular, "all the false carils to the devil, *in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti;*" to which the Pope and the cardinals solemnly responded, "Amen." Forman afterwards took the liberty of explaining the import of his Scoto-Latin petition, which, instead of giving offence, caused the greatest merriment.[1] The scene does not heighten one's ideas of papal and episcopal propriety: we find ourselves in the company of jovial boon companions, rather than of grave and reverend signors; but, apart from this, is it not just possible that even a Presbyterian minister of the present day might find his scholarship to fail him if asked to say a Latin grace; and would it be fair to infer from this that all the Presbyterian clergy were illiterate and ignorant men? If Forman could not speak Latin (which is unlikely), he must have spoken fluently both French and Italian, or he could not have filled the posts which he did.

A.D. 1490. Shevez was now Archbishop of St Andrews, and James began to find that he had a rival in his realm, for the primate seemed to have a pleasure in thwarting the king, and exhibiting his spiritual independence. But James had seen how, in England, the pretensions of Canterbury were kept in check by those of York, and therefore he resolved to balance St Andrews by Glasgow. He importuned the Pope to send to the Bishop of Glasgow the archiepiscopal pallium. "No small wrong and danger," he writes in one of his letters, "might arise to me and my successors from having only one spiritual primate throughout my whole kingdom. Honours ought to be distributed, and as the sovereign pontiffs have divided the power, jurisdiction, and dignity ecclesiastical in the realm of England to its advantage, it would have been to the honour and dignity of my realm had you, with the counsel of the Sacred College, raised the Church of Glasgow to enjoy all the privileges and dignities of that of York, the Church of St Andrews being of similar creation to that of Canterbury." Speaking with just pride of the Church of St Mungo, the monarch said, "I have written many letters

---

[1] Lindsay, History, p. 106. Though Lindsay gives this story, it looks apocryphal.

to you and the Sacred College for the raising of the famous Church of Glasgow, which surpasses the other cathedral churches of my realm by its structure, its learned men, its foundation, its ornaments, and other very noble prerogatives, to metropolitan, primatial, and born legatine rank, like the Church of York in England." He begs the Pope not to listen to the representations of the Archbishop of St Andrews, but to grant the petition of a prince so devoted to him, as otherwise he would consider himself despised. The importunities of the king at length prevailed, and in 1490 Innocent VIII. issued a bull erecting Glasgow into an archbishopric, and placing the dioceses of Glasgow, Galloway, Dunblane, and Lismore under its jurisdiction.[1] The Archbishop of St Andrews could ill brook this diminution of a glory and a power so recently received, and refused to acknowledge the new archbishop. A furious feud was the result, which was handed down from archbishop to archbishop, and Knox describes with infinite humour and glee a quarrel for precedence between the followers of the two archbishops at Glasgow.[2]

A.D. 1494.

Blackadder, the new archbishop, soon showed his zeal for the Church which had raised him to such honour. Opinions opposed to the established faith and worship were beginning to be widely diffused. A class of religionists called Lollards had sprung up, and were numerous, especially in the districts of Carrick, Kyle, and Cunningham; and the archbishop resolved if possible to purge his diocese of heretics. Thirty suspected persons were accordingly cited to appear before the king and his council in the year 1494, among whom were Reid of Barskimming, Campbell of Cessnock, Campbell of Newmills, Shaw of Polkemmet, Helen Chalmers, Lady Polkillie, and Isabel Chalmers, Lady Stairs. Their indictment contained thirty-four different articles. Among the chief of these were:—That images, relics, and the virgin, were not proper objects of worship; that the bread and wine in the sacrament were not transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ; that no priest or pope could grant absolutions or indulgences; that masses could not profit the dead; that miracles had ceased; and that priests might lawfully marry. They appear also to have been accused of opinions which struck at the civil power; but there is no evidence that they acknowledged these, and it is more than

---

[1] Brown's Calendar of State Papers in Venice, pp. 204-10.

[2] History, book i.

probable they were false. Blackadder conducted the prosecution, and tried to entangle the accused, but Barskimming answered the charges with such wit and good humour that the accusation was turned into laughter. James IV., though somewhat superstitious, was not inclined to be a persecutor, and so the proceedings were quashed.[1]

In the beginning of the sixteenth century there was introduced into our country an art, almost unnoticed by our ancient chroniclers, but which has done more to revolutionise society, and shape the destinies of the Church and the world, than any other human discovery. In 1450 the first printed book issued from the German press, and it is pleasing to know that that book was a Bible. "We may see in imagination," says Mr Hallam, "this venerable and splendid volume leading up the crowded myriads of its followers, and imploring, as it were, a blessing on the new art, by dedicating its first fruits to the service of heaven."[2] About 1474 the art was introduced into England by Caxton. It required upwards of thirty years more to penetrate into Scotland. Walter Chepman, a servant in the king's household, has the merit of having set the first printing-press at work in our country. In 1508 he printed a small volume of pamphlets, and soon after, the "Breviary of Aberdeen." The king warmly patronised the printer, purchased his books, and granted him a patent to exercise his craft, the original of which still exists among the national records.[3]

We cannot agree with those who think that the reformation of religion was the necessary consequence of the invention of printing and the diffusion of knowledge. But though printing was not the parent of the Reformation, it was one of its most powerful auxiliaries. It diffused knowledge, and thus diminished the distance between the clergy and laity. It made the communication of ideas easy, and thus sentiments, which must otherwise have been limited to a few, were extended to the many. When the Reformation broke out in Germany, the books of the Reformers found their way into Scotland. When the fulness of the time had come at home, the printing-press was called into use, and treatises, squibs, plays, and satirical songs issued thickly from it, like barbed arrows.

---

[1] Knox's History of the Reformation, book i.

[2] Introduction to Hist. of Lit., vol. i. p. 211.

[3] Tytler's History, vol. v.

Though printing did not create the new ideas, it gave them utterance.

On the 9th of September 1513 James IV. was killed on the fatal field of Flodden. Alexander Stewart, his natural son, fell fighting by his side. This youth had studied in early life under Erasmus of Rotterdam. While yet a boy he was preferred to the Archbishopric of St Andrews; but when he donned the cassock, he did not think it necessary to doff the coat of mail. Nor did the age deem it necessary—popes had appeared at the head of armies. When the expedition had reached England, besieged Norham, and taken Ford Castle, a perfect paralysis came over the Scotch army. Lindsay declares that the king had been captivated by the beauty of the lady of the castle, and that while he spent his time in dalliance with her, the young prelate, his son, made love to her daughter; and thus weeks were wasted, victuals became scarce, the army melted away, and the golden opportunity of victory was lost.[1] They both paid for their folly by their lives, but their gallantry does not atone for their guilt, as it did not restore to Scotland the many brave and noble ones who died in their defence.

The life of James IV. affords a good illustration of the religious life of the period; and his temperament was one which we frequently meet with, swinging him to and fro between scandalous sinnings and bitter repentings, overflowing joyousness and profound melancholy. The part he took in the treason which ended in his father's death made a wound on his conscience which would not heal; and though he could never resist a woman's charms, when the first flush of love was over, he was always ready to do penance for his crimes. In 1494 Pope Alexander VI. sent his legate to Scotland to comfort the king, who had become disquieted on account of his father's death. By the power given him by the Pope, the nuncio absolved the penitent, having first imposed as a penance that he should wear an iron chain about his waist all the days of his life, which James is said faithfully to have done.[2] Still religious sadness sometimes haunted him, and on these occasions he was wont to shut himself up in a convent, and refuse to see anyone but his confessor. The monastery of the Observantines at Stirling was his favourite retreat, whither he frequently retired, especially in Lent, and lived in every respect like a brother of the order.

---

[1] Lindsay, History, p. 113.

[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. i.

Seasons of gladness had also their peculiar expressions of thankfulness. On the 21st of February 1506, his young queen was brought to bed of a son, but after her delivery became dangerously ill. She recovered, however, and her fond, though sometimes delinquent husband set out upon foot in pilgrimage to St Ninian's Cathedral Church, in performance of a vow which he had made for her recovery. In the month of July, when the fair Margaret was perfectly restored, the royal couple set out together upon a second pilgrimage to Whitehorn, that together they might offer up their united thanks at the holy shrine. A third time in the same year did the devout monarch set out upon a pilgrimage, directing his steps on this occasion to the shrine of St Duthac, in Ross-shire.[1] Such devotion could not but be pleasing to the head of the Church, especially at a time when heretics were beginning to abound; and, accordingly, he sent to the pious monarch a cap and sword, and the title of "Protector of the Faith."[2] The king gratefully received the papal gifts; but, so far as religion was concerned, he wisely allowed the sword to remain in its scabbard, and his reign is not stained by the blood of a single martyr.

CHAPTER VIII.

In the same year in which Flodden was fought, Leo X. ascended the pontifical throne. Come of the magnificent house of the Medici, he had at once the faults and the virtues of his family. Gay, kind-hearted, and affable, every one left his presence full of his praise. Fond of ease and self-indulgence, averse to business and its drudgery, he frequently neglected the responsibilities of government; and yet he possessed a prudence, and even sagacity, which on several grave emergencies gave him a superiority over the ablest diplomatists of Europe. Careless about religion, and not quite unimpeachable in morals, he was yet vastly more exemplary than several of the popes who had preceded him. He was elegant in all his tastes, and a most liberal patron of the arts and sciences. His ante-rooms were constantly filled with sculptors, painters,

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, vol. i.

[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. i. This is understood to be the sword still preserved amongst the regalia in the Castle of Edinburgh.

poets, comedians, and artificers in silver and gold. The recovery of an antique statue, the colouring of a modern Madonna, the performance of a new drama, or comedy, or piece of music, any object of *vertu*, any appliance of art, prodigiously interested the polite and voluptuous pontiff. The Vatican was the scene of continual feasting: delicate viands, sparkling wines, handsome women, witty men—talk about some mosaic recently dug up from an old Roman villa, or of a lost book of Livy happily found in the shelves of an ancient monastery[1]—amusements in which indecency appeared disguised in a thin but always most graceful drapery, dreamily filled up the days and nights of those who enjoyed the Pope's hospitality. But all this could not be done for nought. If a sumptuous board was to be daily spread, if artists were to be patronized, and their productions purchased, if largesses were to be given to the people, and costly spectacles exhibited for their diversion, money must be obtained. Golden ducats alone could do this.

Prior to this period, Rome had made a belief in purgatory a part of its creed. In the burning abyss of that middle estate must the dead expiate the sins which they had not expiated on earth; and the living were led by monkish orators to contemplate their departed relatives as writhing for centuries in quenchless flames before their final admission to heaven, and to look forward themselves to the same fiery refining process. But their case was not hopeless. Indulgences had been invented; and the man who was in possession of one of these might confidently calculate upon exemption from purgatorial fires. For a few florins, a man might escape centuries of torment. For a few florins more, he might secure the deliverance of some one, now dead, once dear to him as his own life. If a scoundrel had been guilty of polygamy, six ducats would save him; if he had committed murder, he must pay eight; if he had contracted the greatest of all sins, sacrilege, nine would shut the gates of hell, and throw wide open the doors of paradise.[2] Such doctrines must have been most comfort-

---

[1] In a letter dated November 1517, Leo requires from his Commissioners of Indulgences 147 gold ducats, to pay for a manuscript of the 33d Book of Livy.

[2] For special sins Tetzel had a special scale. Polygamy cost six ducats, sacrilege nine, murder eight, witchcraft two. Samson, who carried on the same traffic in Switzerland as Tetzel in Germany, had a different scale. He charged for infanticide four livres tournois; for a parricide or fratricide, one ducat.

ing to the people; and if comforting to the people, they were most profitable to the Church. Besides the ordinary traffic in indulgences, several pontiffs, when pressed for money, had published a general sale, and instantly their coffers were filled. To what better device could the prodigal Leo resort? What better pretext for the need of money could pontiff have? Michael Angelo had conceived the mighty dome of St Peter's. The greatest of Christian temples was begun; but the work languished for want of means. The bones of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul were exposed to the rains of heaven: what more Christian enterprise than to help and hasten its completion? A bull was accordingly published, proclaiming a general indulgence, the product of which was to be appropriated to the building of St Peter's. The lucrative trade was farmed out to a contractor. Tetzel appeared in Germany, hawking his spiritual wares. "Draw near," cried he, "and I will give you letters, duly sealed, by which even the sins you shall hereafter desire to commit shall be all forgiven you. There is no sin so great that the indulgence cannot remit it; and even if any one should (which is doubtless impossible) ravish the Holy Virgin Mother of God, let him pay—let him only pay largely, and it shall be forgiven him. But more than all this, indulgences save not the living alone—they also save the dead. The very moment that the money clinks against the bottom of the chest, the soul escapes from purgatory and flies free to heaven."[1] Luther could stand this no longer: he nailed his theses to the church-door at Wittemberg, and the Reformation was begun.

The Reformation, thus begun in Saxony, spread rapidly over all Germany, and soon began to affect the other countries of Europe. At first it was purely a religious reformation, but it contained within its bosom the germ of great changes, both in the social and political world. The contempt of authority, and the spirit of inquiry which it engendered, gave a new impulse to thought. The duties it inculcated, and the doctrines it taught, awoke a thousand feelings which had long lain dormant in the mind, and roused them to action. Christianity was no longer a matter of form. It was no longer confined to the priesthood: it extended alike to the noble, the burgher, and the peasant. Hitherto shut up in the cloister, or displayed as

---

[1] D'Aubigné's Hist., vol. i. p. 263. The historian states in a note that Tetzel publicly maintained the second of these propositions in his antitheses.

a pageant in the cathedral, its holy influences were unfelt by the great mass of the people; but now it became a subject of serious thought and earnest discussion to all. A spirit of new life was breathed over society. The religious feelings of our nature put on their native strength, and eagerly enlisted either on the side of the Reformation or the Papacy. A great struggle was begun. The din of battle everywhere resounded. The confused noise came booming over the German Ocean, and was distinctly heard on the shores of Scotland.

A.D. 1513. But we must revert to our insular history, and trace the events which preceded the Reformation at home. The battle of Flodden subjected our country once more to the distractions of a long minority. The king, thirteen earls, an archbishop, two bishops, and many others of name and note, lay dead on the fatal field. The infant monarch was however solemnly crowned,[1] and the regency of the kingdom committed to the queen-mother, the sister of Henry VIII., a woman still in the flower of youth, possessed of great beauty, spirit, and ability, but subject, like her brother, to violent passions, and not more careful of decency in matters affecting marriage and divorce. With indecorous haste she threw off her royal weeds, and wedded the Earl of Angus, a handsome but impetuous young man, by which she forfeited the regency, and the Duke of Albany, at that time residing in France, was recalled to take the government of the kingdom. The consequence was, a bitter and very natural hostility sprung up between Queen Margaret and the Duke, who had supplanted her in the government; and the nobility began to divide themselves into two factions—the English and the French—and for the next fifty years we find these factions thus formed contending for the chief direction of affairs.

The archiepiscopal chair of St Andrews was next in dignity to the royal throne, and it also was made vacant by the slaughter of Flodden. Three powerful competitors appeared in the field. The first of these was the celebrated Gawin Douglas, son of Archibald Douglas, Bell-the-Cat, uncle of the Earl of Angus, who had married the queen, and known to some as the translator of the Æneid of Virgil into the Scotch vernacular. He was presented by Margaret, and his literary merits

---

[1] Buchanan, Lesley, Lindsay, and Balfour say the coronation took place at Stirling; but Pinkerton, on the evidence of an original letter (Dacre to the Bishop of Durham, 29th October 1513), makes it take place at Scone, and him Tytler follows.

made him worthy of the honour, but despite his poetry he was a factious and intriguing man. The second was John Hepburn, Prior of St Andrews. He managed to get himself elected by the chapter. The third was Andrew Forman, Bishop of Moray, and legate *a latere*, who had procured a papal bull nominating him to the vacant See. There were thus, in this instance, the three modes of nomination which then existed, and which frequently conflicted—that by the pope, by the king, and by the canons of the cathedral church. The adherents of Douglas seized upon the castle. Hepburn collected his followers and attacked them, and having carried the fortress by storm, he strongly garrisoned it. Foiled at this point, Douglas retired from the contest. Forman for a while could find no one sufficiently bold to publish his bull. At length he bribed Lord Home, by bestowing upon his brother the vacant priory of Coldingham. Accordingly Home proceeded to Edinburgh with ten thousand men, and there proclaimed the bull in favour of Forman. He next marched towards St Andrews, in order to intimate what had been done, and to give the bishop institution and full possession of his benefice. But Hepburn again rallied his adherents, manned both the cathedral and the castle, planted artillery around them, and made such a formidable show of resistance, that Forman felt it would be better to resort to other means than force to get possession of his archbishopric.[1] The ecclesiastical feud was finally settled by the Duke of Albany on his arrival in the country. He confirmed Forman in the archbishopric, and bestowed upon his rival enough of beneficiary spoil to allay his disappointment and chagrin.

A.D. 1520. These tumults were quickly followed by another, in which we find some of the same actors engaged. A deadly animosity existed between the houses of Angus and Arran. During the sitting of the Estates the adherents of both had mustered in considerable numbers in Edinburgh, and an outbreak was apprehended. The Hamiltons had met in the church of the Black Friars to concert their measures. Gawin Douglas, Bishop of Dunkeld, ventured amongst them as a peacemaker, and, addressing himself chiefly to Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, remonstrated with him against the hostilities which were too evidently intended. Beaton struck his hand upon his breast, and declared he could not help it; but a coat of mail, concealed beneath his linen

---

[1] Lindsay, p. 123.

rochet, gave forth a metallic and suspicious sound. "Ah, my lord," said Douglas, "I perceive your conscience clatters." The mediation of the Bishop of Dunkeld was fruitless; a hasty attack was made by the retainers of the Hamiltons upon the borderers who owned Angus for their chief, and who were now drawn up in the High Street from the castle to St Giles. It was speedily and decisively repulsed; Lord Montgomery and Sir Patrick Hamilton were among the slain; the Earl of Arran was forced to flee the city, and the Archbishop of Glasgow to take refuge behind the high altar of the Dominican church, where he would have been sacrilegiously slain had not Gawin Douglas generously interfered. This armed encounter is known in history by the name of "cleansing the causeway."[1]

The political history of this period is full of strange and sudden transitions. Albany was more a Frenchman than a Scot, and soon made himself enemies, though historians are yet divided in regard to his administration. The queen-mother thought him imperious, and this her proud spirit could not brook. Deprived of the care of her royal infant, she fled to England, where she was brought to bed of a daughter to Angus. Not long afterwards Albany sailed for France, where his heart always was; and he was not well gone till Margaret returned. Completely estranged from her husband, whose fidelity was questioned, she could not now bide his presence, and already began to speak of a divorce. Imagining herself, at the same time, neglected by her brother, she turned her eyes towards France, and by a letter in her own hand invited Albany to return and resume the government of the kingdom. He came, landed in Lennox, and the queen hurried to Linlithgow to meet and welcome him. Rumour now began to speak of an intimacy too tender to be merely political, and Henry believed the report, and wrote his sister sharp letters of reproof.[2] Amid the fluctuations of parties, she afterwards affected a reconciliation with her husband, but it was only to part from him in greater anger and disgust, and finally to procure a divorce. At liberty to marry again, she took to her royal couch a young man, the son of Lord Avondale, and afterwards created Lord Methven. This indecent conduct lowered her influence; Albany had bid Scotland farewell; and Angus for a time got into his hands the chief management of affairs, although the king, now thirteen years of age, had

---

[1] Pinkerton, vol. ii. p. 181. Tytler, vol. v.

[2] Pinkerton, vol. ii. books xii., xiii.

nominally assumed the government. The troubles which these things implied were industriously augmented by English gold and English spies, for Henry and Wolsey had already begun the system which was afterwards brought to perfection by Elizabeth and Burleigh.

Gawin Douglas was deeply involved in most of the transactions to which we have referred. At first a keen ally of the queen, when she quarrelled with her husband he became her bitterest enemy. Proceeding to England, he sunk into a political intriguer, propagated slanders against his royal relative and Albany, and even advised the invasion of his country to remove them from power. As one might expect, Scotland became too hot for him; the romantic valley of the Tay and the hills of Dunkeld did not afford him a safe asylum, and he was obliged to take up his residence in London, where he died. His translation of the "Æneid" into Scotch verse, and his other poetical works, have kept alive his name, when his intrigues are almost forgotten. All allow him to have been a man of singular learning and fine wit, and we must ever admire him as among the first who made our wild untutored mother-tongue to flow in the soft, measured cadences of verse.

During these political troubles Lutheran opinions were slowly finding their way into the country, and among other converts was one who held high office in the Church. PATRICK HAMILTON was the son of Sir Patrick Hamilton of Kincavil, and Catherine Stewart, a daughter of the Duke of Albany. The date and place of his birth are unknown; but when yet a boy, according to the custom of the time, he was made Abbot of Ferne. Destined for the Church, he required such an education as would suit him for his profession; and accordingly, about the year 1517, he left Scotland, to pursue a course of philosophy in the University of Paris; and in 1520 he acquired his degree of Master of Arts. In 1523 he returned to his native country, and entered himself in St Andrews University, where he continued to pursue his studies under the celebrated John Mair, the master of Buchanan and of Knox. Distinguished by a passion for music, he was appointed precentor of the choir of St Leonards, and is said to have composed "what the musicians call a mass arranged in parts for nine voices, in honour of the angels, intended for that office in the missal which begins '*Benedicant Dominum Angeli Ejus.*'"[1]

---

[1] Alesius: quoted in Memoirs of Patrick Hamilton, by Rev. Peter Lorimer.

But while at Paris he seems to have imbibed the free sentiments of Erasmus and Reuchlin, and he must have heard at least of the theses of Luther. He consequently fell under the suspicion of heresy, and inquisition was made into his opinions. Thus threatened he again left Scotland, and went to Germany, where the human mind was now in open mutiny against papal authority. Prevented from going to Wittemberg by the plague, he turned aside to the little university town of Marburg, where he remained for a time, and was confirmed in the doctrines of the Reformation. Francis Lambert, who taught there, took an affectionate interest in the young Scotsman, and had a powerful influence in moulding his mind.

A.D. 1527.

In 1527 he was in Scotland once more, not ashamed of the opinions he had embraced. Archbishop James Beaton had been transferred from Glasgow to St Andrews, and had recently made peace with the party of Angus, now at the head of affairs. He had the power, if he had the will, to put Hamilton to death; and Beaton was too zealous a churchman to let Lutheranism escape with impunity, but it is more than probable that theological intolerance was inflamed by the feud which existed between the houses of Angus and Arran. Hamilton was brought to St Andrews, and tried before a bench of bishops and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. In the sentence pronounced against him the judges declare,—"We have found the same Mr Patrick Hamilton many ways infected with heresy, disputing, holding, and maintaining divers heresies of Martin Luther and his followers, repugnant to our faith, and which are already condemned by general councils, and most famous universities. And he, being under the same infamy, . . . passed to other parts furth of the realm, suspected and noted of heresy; and, being lately returned, not being admitted, but of his own head, without license or privilege, hath presumed to preach wicked heresy." "All these premises being considered, we, having God and the integrity of our faith before our eyes, do pronounce, determine, and declare the said Mr Patrick Hamilton, for his affirming, confessing, and declaring the aforesaid heresies, and his pertinacity, to be an heretic, and to have an evil opinion of the faith, and therefore to be condemned and punished, likeas we condemn and define him to be punished by this our sentence definitive, depriving him, and sentencing him to be deprived, of all dignities, honours, orders, offices, and benefices of the Church; and therefore do judge him to

be delivered over unto the secular power to be punished, and his goods confiscate."[1]

A.D. 1528. On the last day of February 1528 a stake was fixed in the ground in the centre of the large area before the gate of St Salvator's College. Around it fagots of wood were piled high. At noon the young and noble confessor left his prison for the place of execution. He was accompanied by his servant and two or three faithful friends, and carried in his hand a copy of the Evangel. Being come to the place, he gave the volume he so much loved to a friend; and, taking off his gown, he gave it with some other apparel to his servant, remarking, "This stuff will not help me in the fire, yet will do thee some good. I have no more to leave thee but the ensample of my death, which I pray thee keep in mind. For albeit the same be bitter, and painful in man's judgment, yet is it the entrance to everlasting life, which none can inherit who deny Christ."[2] By the ignorance and awkwardness of his executioners, his torments were protracted for nearly six hours. It was six o'clock in the evening before his body was reduced to ashes. "But during all that time," says Alexander Alane, who had witnessed the whole scene with profound emotion, "the martyr never gave one sign of impatience or anger, nor ever called to Heaven for vengeance upon his persecutors, so great was his faith, so strong his confidence in God."[3] His last words that were heard were, "How long, Lord, shall darkness cover this kingdom? How long wilt Thou suffer this tyranny of men? Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!"

So died Patrick Hamilton, the proto-martyr of the Lutheran Reformation. It was strange that the theses of Luther, posted upon the door of the church at Wittemberg in 1517, should so soon have been burnt with fire into the gates of St Salvator's College at St Andrews. No nobler or gentler spirit ever passed through great tribulation into the kingdom of God. His youth, his accomplishments, his many virtues, excited universal pity; and it was afterwards said, that the smoke of the flames, in which he had been consumed, infected all that they blew upon. Very recently there was discovered in the accounts of the Lord Treasurer, under the year 1543, the name of an Isobel Hamilton, one of the ladies in attendance

---

[1] The sentence is found at length in the Appendix to Keith's History.

[2] Spottiswood, lib. ii.

[3] Quoted in Lorimer's Memoirs of Hamilton, p. 155.

on the court of the Regent Arran, and described as "daughter of umquhil Patrick Hamilton, Abbot of Ferne." It was instantly suspected that the martyr's virtue had not been immaculate; but Alesius tells us, in a tract till lately unknown, that immediately after his return from Germany he had married a lady of noble birth, and thus, like Luther, had openly and irretrievably broken with Rome.[1] It has indeed been questioned if he ever was a priest, for it does not appear he was more than Commendator Abbot of Ferne. If he was a priest and married, his marriage must have been clandestine, as otherwise it would certainly have been made a chief charge against him.[2]

Three months after the execution of Hamilton, James contrived to escape from the Douglases, gathered the nobility around him, and being now in his seventeenth year, and possessed of wisdom and firmness above his age, took the government upon his own shoulders. His hatred of Angus and all his relatives, who had kept him so long in virtual captivity, was deep and incurable. He could never be brought to forgive them. He confiscated their estates, and drave them from the kingdom. We need not wonder that they were the objects of his aversion and dread. They undoubtedly sowed the seeds of many of the evils which bore such bitter fruit during his reign. Though carefully watching his movements, in order to prevent his slipping out of their hands, they had ruinously indulged him, neglected his education, and encouraged his early inclination to gallantry, and thus fostered the vices which afterwards contaminated his character and hastened his end. The fear of his barons, thus early inspired, made him throw himself more completely upon the support of his clergy; while alarm at the intrigues of the English court, which had long kept the kingdom in perpetual agitation, led him to suspect and avoid all the overtures of Henry.

A.D. 1532. We do not require to wander far out of our way to record the institution, in 1532, of the College of Justice, the first great step in our country toward

---

[1] Lorimer's Memoirs, p. 124. Also Appendix to Laing's edition of Knox's works.

[2] The statement in his sentence, "not being admitted, but of his own head, without license or privilege, hath presumed to preach wicked heresy," seems to prove he was not in priest's orders. Then, there is no mention of his being degraded before he was burned, as would have been the case had he been a priest.

the equitable administration of the law. The idea is said to have been taken from the parliament of Paris. It was to consist of fifteen members, eight of whom, including the president, were to belong to the ecclesiastical order. Ten advocates were appointed to conduct the pleadings before it; the clerks of the signet were ordered to be sworn, and everything down to the appointment of macers was minutely provided for. The expenses of the court were to be defrayed out of the revenues of the clergy, who, deeming the honour done to their order to be no compensation for the injury inflicted on their property, remonstrated against the exaction, but in vain. There can be no doubt but that the constitution of the college is a testimony to the superior learning and abilities of the ecclesiastics.

It was about the same time that Antonio Campeggio visited Scotland, as papal legate, to confirm James in his attachment to the ancient faith. He brought him from the Pope a consecrated cap and sword; addressed him as "Defender of the Faith," a title which his uncle Henry of England was held to have forfeited, and granted him a tithe of all ecclesiastical benefices in the kingdom for three years—a most acceptable present to a profuse prince.[1]

Meanwhile the doctrines of the Reformation were making rapid progress in Scotland. The Lollards had not been extirpated,—some of them still remained, ancient witnesses of the truth. Men were passing to and fro betwixt our island and the Continent, and ever bringing fresh tidings of the progress of Protestantism. Vessels were arriving at Aberdeen, Montrose, Dundee, and Leith, and stealthily discharging packages of Tyndale's English New Testament, and the pamphlets and sermons of the Reformers.[2] These stirred up the people like a trumpet-blast; they began to scent the battle from afar. Poets were not afraid to lampoon the idle monks and friars; wits perpetrated jokes at the expense of the voluptuous bishops; and even the rustics, when they met at the ale-house, told scandalous stories about the parish priest—some concubine he kept, or some good-looking woman he had inveigled at confession.[3] But there were earnest-minded men in the Church who perceived that a reformation was

---

[1] Tytler, vol. v.

[2] Among other proofs of this importation of books, we have an Act of the Scotch Parliament declaring it penal.

[3] Dunbar and Lyndsay's poems give ample proof of this.

needed; there were honest hearts beneath the monkish gown, which could not stifle their feelings. In Scotland, as in Germany, the Reformation began among the clergy themselves. Almost all our first martyrs and confessors were monks or parish priests.

The flames in which the Abbot of Ferne was consumed had scarcely died out among his ashes, when Alexander Seaton, a Dominican friar, and confessor to the king, began to preach the necessity of keeping the commandments, and of looking to Christ as the end and perfection of the law. He was called to task for his sentiments, and glad to save his life by fleeing to England. At Berwick he wrote a letter to James pointing out the subordination of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, and urging his Majesty, in respectful terms, to put an end to the oppression of the clergy. But the king did not interfere to save him, and so he was compelled to remain in exile.[1]

It was not to be expected that a Church, backed by the influence of the King, proud of a venerable antiquity, and ignorant of the duty of toleration, would allow opinions destructive of its power, its privileges, and its very existence, to grow up in its bosom without a struggle to crush them. We think it needless to relate minutely the story of every martyrdom and of every martyr. It is everywhere and at all times the same sad tale. Henry Forest, a young Benedictine monk, was burnt at St Andrews in 1533. In the year following, Norman Gourlay, a priest, and David Straiton, a gentleman of respectable family, were hanged and burned at the rood of Greenside, "according," says Knox, "to the mercy of the papistical Church."[2] Numbers were arraigned, but their faith failed, and they recanted. Others of whom the country was not worthy, fled, and transferred their allegiance and learned labours to other lands. Among these were Alexander Alesius, who became Professor of Divinity at Leipsic, and the friend of Melancthon; and John Machabæus, who rose to high favour with Christiern, King of Denmark, and was honoured to be one of the translators of the Bible into the Danish tongue.

A.D. 1538.

In July 1538, the parliament met, and, amongst other things, passed a law, which is indicative at once of the progress the reformed doctrines were making, and of the disposition of the government toward them. This act,

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] Ibid.

after referring to an act passed in the year 1525, against the "damnable opinions of the great heretic Luther," proceeds—"Our said Sovereign Lord, for the zeal and love his Highness bears to the Christian faith and the Holy Kirk, ordains and statutes the said act anew. Likewise, it is statute and ordained, that forasmuch as the damnable opinions of heresy are spread in diverse countries by the heretic Luther and his disciples, and this realm, and the lieges thereof, has firmly persisted in the holy faith, since the same was first received by them, and never as yet admitted any opinions contrary to the Christian faith, but ever has been clean of all such filth and vice; therefore, that no manner of person, stranger, that happens to arrive with their ship within any part of this realm, bring with them any books or works of the said Luther, his disciples or servants, disputes or rehearses his heresies or opinions, unless it be to the confusion thereof, and that by clerks in the schools, under the pain of escheating their ships and goods, and putting of their persons in prison." It is farther provided—"That none have, use, keep, or conceal any books of the said heretics, or countenance their doctrine and opinions, but that they deliver the same to their ordinaries within forty days."[1]

Meanwhile Henry VIII. had revolted against Rome. When the Reformation first broke out he had entered the lists against Luther, and published a treatise on the seven sacraments, in answer to a book which had been published by the reformer on the Babylonish captivity. The royal production was presented to the Pope in full consistory; His Holiness spoke of it as the result of inspiration, and bestowed upon its author the title of Defender of the Faith. But passion will sometimes interfere with faith; and in despotic governments the caprices of an individual may overturn the religion of a whole people. The Defender of the Faith had grown weary of Catherine of Arragon; he pretended scruples of conscience about having her to wife, because she had been the wife of his deceased brother, and craved a divorce from the Pope; but the Pope, fearful of offending her nephew the Emperor Charles V., was not so compliant as he might have been to so orthodox a king. Without refusing the royal request, he staved it off upon various pretences; and Henry got impatient, for he had seen and loved Anne Boleyn. In these circumstances Cranmer proposed to solve the difficulty, by getting the opinions of the

---

[1] Keith's History, book i. chap. i. Acts of the Scottish Parliament.

most famous universities in regard to the legitimacy of his marriage, and, if these should prove unfavourable to it, to have a divorce pronounced by his own clergy. Henry swore that Cranmer had the right sow by the ear. The thing was done; the opinions were unfavourable; and the divorce was pronounced by Cranmer himself, who had now been raised to the See of Canterbury. Excommunicated by the Court of Rome, Henry was declared by his own parliament the only supreme head of the Church of England upon earth; and the papal supremacy was for ever at an end. The Rubicon being thus crossed, monasteries were suppressed, and their enormous revenues appropriated by the monarch, or bestowed upon his courtiers, and the people flattered with the notion that henceforward they would require to pay no more taxes. But though the English monarch had thus abolished the Roman jurisdiction within his realm, he had no intention of reforming the Romish ritual or the Romish creed. "The scheme," says Macaulay, "was merely to transfer the full cup of sorceries from the Babylonian enchantress to other hands, spilling as little as possible by the way."[1] Accordingly, with the utmost impartiality, Henry struck off men's heads for maintaining the Pope's supremacy, or for denying the dogma of transubstantiation; for owning the jurisdiction of Rome, or for denying her doctrines. Such was the beginning and the ending of Henry's reformation of religion in England.

But the English monarch was most anxious to extend his reformation, such as it was, to the sister kingdom; and we find him labouring, with all the zeal of a new proselyte, to convert his nephew of Scotland to his faith. With this view he made a proposal of a marriage between James and his daughter, the Princess Mary, holding out to him the hope of succeeding to the English crown. He despatched his chaplain, Dr Barlow, Bishop-elect of St Davids, to the Scottish court to remove false impressions; to present to the young monarch a book recently published, called "The Doctrine of a Christian Man;" and, if permission were granted, to display his no-popery eloquence in the pulpit. James submitted the treatise to his ecclesiastics, who pronounced it full of heresy, and unfit for the royal eyes; and Barlow wrote to Secretary Cromwell informing him that the king was surrounded "by the Pope's pestilent creatures and very limbs of the devil."[2]

---

[1] Critical and Historical Essays, vol. i. p. 131.

[2] Pinkerton, book xiv. Keith's History, book i. Tytler, vol. v.

Barlow was followed by Lord William Howard, who was instructed to propose a conference at York between his master and James; but though James at first consented to meet his uncle, he afterwards, through the influence of his clergy, made pretexts for delay, and the conference never took place. It would appear, however, that Henry's overtures had made some impression on the king, for in May 1536 he advertises him "that he had sent to Rome to get impetrations for reformation of some enormities, and especially anent the ordering of great and many possessions and temporal lands, given to the kirk by our noble predecessors."[1]. We need not wonder that the diplomatists both of London and Rome should thus anxiously be visiting Scotland. Its relative position to England made its movements of more than ordinary consequence. It was a strategical point in the field, which it was of the greatest importance for the Pope to retain and for Henry to carry.

James wished for a wife, and his thoughts were fixed upon the daughters of France. Disdaining to entrust the courtship into the hands of diplomatists, he set sail for Dieppe, and having landed, hastened to Paris—a romantic knight-errant in search of a lady-love. He had no sooner seen than he loved Magdalene, the only daughter of Francis I., a beautiful girl of seventeen; but her fragile figure and hectic complexion were already indicative of consumption and prophetic of death. Mutual affection would not listen to reason, and so their nuptials were celebrated with extraordinary pomp in the Church of Notre Dame. Refused a passage through England the royal pair were compelled to return to Scotland by sea; and when the devoted girl landed at Leith she knelt down upon the beach, kissed the very sand, and solemnly thanked God for having brought her husband and herself safely through the sea to the land of her adoption.[2] But she came only to find a grave. In two months she was dead—a flower too tender for northern skies. James mourned her in death as he had loved her in life; but, young and hopeful, he dried his tears, and before the days of his mourning were accomplished, he had sought and obtained the hand of Mary of Guise, the widow of the Duke of Longueville—a marriage which had the most important influence upon the future fortunes of the kingdom.

A.D. 1539. On the last day of February 1539 a huge fire was blazing on the Castle Hill of Edinburgh, and five miserable men were seen in the midst of it—suffering,

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. ii.

[2] Lindsay of Pitscottie, p. 159.

yet rejoicing. They were Dean Thomas Forret, Vicar of Dollar, and a canon regular of the monastery of St Colm's, Inch; Sir Duncan Simpson, a priest; Keillor and Beveridge, black friars; and Forrester, a notary in Stirling. They had been tried for heresy before a council held by Cardinal Beaton and William Chisholme, Bishop of Dunblane, and this was their end. Keillor, it would appear, had written one of those religious plays or mysteries, common at the period, in which Christ's passion was represented; and this had been acted before the king and court at Stirling, upon the morning of a Good Friday. But it was obvious that under the Scribes and Pharisees, who accomplished the condemnation of Christ, Keillor had painted the Churchmen of his day who were crucifying Christ afresh by persecuting his friends.[1] The satire had been too stinging to be easily forgotten or forgiven. The Vicar of Dollar had some time before incurred the suspicion of Lutheranism by refusing to exact the corpse present —felt by the poor to be an intolerable grievance, and by preaching regularly on the Sundays. He was accordingly cited before Crichton, Bishop of Dunkeld, a prelate more given to hospitality than the study of theology, but evidently a kind-hearted and good-natured man. The conversation which passed between them is characteristic of the times, and therefore we give it at length, as reported by Fox, the martyrologist.

"I love you well," said the bishop, "and therefore I must give you my counsel how you shall rule and guide yourself. My dear Dean Thomas, I am told that you preach the epistle or gospel every Sunday to your parishioners, and that you take not the cow nor the uppermost cloth from your parishioners, which is very prejudicial to the Churchmen, and therefore I would you took your cow and your uppermost cloth, as other Churchmen do, or else it is too much to preach every Sunday; for in so doing you may make the people think that *we* should preach likewise. But it is enough for you, when you find any good epistle, or any good gospel, that setteth forth the liberty of the Holy Church, to preach that, and let the rest be." Forret answered, "My lord, I think that none of my parishioners will complain that I take not the cow nor the uppermost cloth, but will gladly give me the same, together with any other thing that they have, and I will give and communicate with them any thing that I have; and so, my

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

lord, we agree right well, and there is no discord amongst us. And where your lordship saith, 'it is too much to preach every Sunday,' indeed I think it is too little, and also would wish that your lordship did the like." "Nay, nay, Dean Thomas," cried the bishop; "let that be, for we are not ordained to preach." Then said Forret, "Where your lordship biddeth me preach when I find any good epistle or a good gospel, truly, my lord, I have read the New Testament and the Old, and all the epistles and gospels, and among them all I could never find an evil epistle or an evil gospel; but if your lordship will show me the good epistle and the good gospel, then I shall preach the good and omit the evil." The bishop replied, "I thank God that I never knew what the Old and New Testament was; therefore, Dean Thomas, I will know nothing but my portuise and pontifical. Go your way, and let be all these fantasies; for if you persevere in these erroneous opinions, ye will repent when you may not mend it."[1]

In the same year there were burnt as heretics in Glasgow a grey friar named Russel, and a young man named Kennedy, who is said to have had a genius for poetry, and who had probably employed it in lampooning the clergy. It is reported that Archbishop Dunbar would willingly have saved them, but his coadjutors were inexorable.[2]

The panic caused by these burnings made many flee to England for safety.[3] George Buchanan had been acting as tutor to the Lord James Stewart, one of the king's illegitimate children, and had recently received a gown of Paris black lined with satin as mourning for the young queen; but he had satirised the Franciscans, and was imprisoned in the Sea Tower of St Andrews. Happily, for the sake of literature, he escaped by his bedroom window and fled to France,[4] probably with the connivance of the king.

About the same time James Beaton, Archbishop of St Andrews, died, and the primacy passed into the hands of his nephew, David Beaton, already a cardinal, and Bishop of Mirepoix in France. He was a man of great talents, and still greater ambition, devoted heart and soul to the interests of the Church, and himself an embodiment, in many respects, at once of its virtues and its vices. He had already acquired a

---

[1] Martyrology, book viii. [2] Spottiswood, book ii.

[3] Letter of Duke of Norfolk, State Papers, vol. v. p. 155.

[4] Buchanan's History, lib. xiv. Knox's History, book i.

great influence over the mind of the king, and, for the remainder of his life, we may regard him as the main instigator of every public measure both ecclesiastical and political. He was scarcely installed till he convoked at St Andrews a meeting of the great barons and dignified clergy, and harangued them upon "the Church in danger," and followed up his oration by citing Sir John Borthwick to appear and answer to the charge of heresy; but Sir John had wisely fled to England. He was declared guilty, and burned in effigy, first at St Andrews, and afterwards in Edinburgh;[1] but better to be burned ten times in similitude than once in reality.

The year 1539 saw Charles V. and Francis I., who had so long wasted Europe by their wars, at peace with one another; and Henry, alarmed lest a Catholic league might be formed against him, and James invited to join it, despatched Sir Ralph Sadler to the Scottish court, to try the effects of diplomacy. We may well regard this as an important era in our history, for Sadler soon began to exert a strong influence in Scottish affairs, and fortunately his letters and despatches have been preserved, and throw much light upon the state of parties and of public feeling at the time. Sadler's instructions were to persuade the Scottish monarch to break off from Rome, and seize upon the possessions of the abbeys and other religious houses; to discover what he were likely to do in the event of a Catholic league being formed against England; and to bring Cardinal Beaton into suspicion with him by every means, but more especially by showing certain equivocal letters which the cardinal had addressed to his agent at Rome, and which had accidentally fallen into Henry's hands. Sadler was further instructed to renew the proposal of an interview between the two monarchs at York; and to flatter the hopes of James succeeding to the English crown in the event of Prince Edward's death."[2]

Sadler's account of his mission is peculiarly interesting, from the gossiping way in which it communicates to us grave matters of state, and the glimpses it gives us of life at Holyrood three hundred years ago. He tells us that when he sought his first interview he was conducted to the chapel, where he saw the king at mass, kneeling under a cloth of state, with the cardinal, bishops, and nobles kneeling around him. The ambassador was led to a seat behind the place where the

---

[1] Knox's History, book i. Spottiswood, lib. ii. Keith.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. Keith, book i. chap. ii.

monarch was thus devoutly engaged. When the service was over, he was brought to the king, and instantly entered upon his business. He said he was sent by his royal master to assure his Majesty of his friendly feelings, and to offer for his acceptance a present of six geldings, which were on their way to Scotland by sea, and would arrive in the course of another day. James pleasantly received the gift, and declared that if there was anything in his kingdom which his uncle would like, it was quite at his service. Sadler next stated that he had some secret intelligence to communicate, and wished a secret conference, upon which the king fixed the next day before noon.

The next day came; the English ambassador repaired to the palace, and was again taken to the chapel, where he had the benefit of a French sermon, to which the queen and her ladies were listening. He was then conducted to the privy-chamber, and the king took him to a window-recess, that they might there talk over matters together. Sadler, with many apologies, exacted a promise of secrecy from James, and then, with an air of mystery, began to tell him of a letter which had fallen into his master's hands, and which proved Beaton to be holding a treasonable correspondence with Rome. It was written by the Cardinal to Mr Andrew Oliphant, Vicar of Foulis, his agent at the papal court, and was on its way thither under the charge of Crichton of Brunston; but the vessel which conveyed the letter and its bearer was shipwrecked on the English coast. It contained references to ecclesiastical affairs which Henry deemed very suspicious, and therefore had he, in his great solicitude for his nephew's welfare, communicated it to him. Sadler says that while he was narrating all this, and explaining the contents of the letter, he narrowly watched the king, to see what effect it would have upon him. The result of his observation was—"Sometimes the king looked steadfastly at him with a grave countenance, sometimes he bit his lip, sometimes he bowed." When he was done, the king said, "There are two laws, the spiritual and the temporal. The administration of the one belongs to the Pope, and the administration of the other to myself. I shall see to the one, but must leave my clergy to manage the other." Sadler, somewhat disconcerted, offered to show the letter; but the cardinal was all this while in the room, so the king whispered he would rather look at it some other time.

Sadler now broached another subject. It had not yet be-

come fashionable for princes to keep model farms, and rear fat bullocks and prize rams. The ambassador therefore said that he was instructed to state to his Majesty, that his uncle of England had heard with deep concern that he "kept large flocks of sheep, and other such mean things," and that it would be much more royal if he would enrich himself with the plunder of the religious houses in the kingdom. "Then," said Sadler, "you will be able to live like a king, and not meddle with sheep." James declared that he had no sheep, but that the tacksmen of the royal demesnes might have. Alas, James! you were either ignorant of your own flocks and herds, or you were ashamed to acknowledge the possession of "such mean things" to your august relative. But your treasurer's accounts have made it known to a still more august posterity, that at that very time you had numerous flocks grazing in the forests of Ettrick, and you need not have blushed to own it.

But James was poor, and Henry knew it, and had suggested a way in which he might become passing rich. "I thank my uncle for his advice," said James, "but in good faith I cannot do so, for methinks it against reason and God's laws to put down these abbeys and religious houses, which have stood so long, and maintained God's service." "And what need have I to take of them to increase my livelihood?" continued the monarch. "There is not an abbey in Scotland at this hour, but, if I asked anything, would give it." Sadler urged that the monks were an idle, unprofitable kind of people, and withal very unchaste. The king replied, "that a few might be bad, but it were a pity that for the sake of these all should be destroyed." Beat off on this point, the ambassador next referred to the league which it was rumoured his Majesty had entered into with France; but the king laughed at this, and denied it utterly. Last of all, Sadler touched upon the conference which his master wished to have with his Majesty. James showed an evident disposition to waive this matter, and remarked, that if such a conference took place, he would like the King of France to be present at it.

The next day was Sunday, and again the ambassador was sent for. He came to exhibit the geldings, which had now arrived; but, as before, he was first of all brought into the chapel, where the whole court was assembled. The service being done, the horses were mounted and put through their paces, and the barbary and jennet particularly praised. The

master of the household now came and announced that dinner was ready, upon which the king went and washed, and then sat down, having told his lords to take the ambassador with them. At table, besides the king, there were the Cardinal, the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Earls of Huntly, Errol, Cassillis, and Athole, the Bishop of Aberdeen, Lord Erskine, and some others. After dinner, Sadler politely thanked the king for having so kindly entertained so poor a man as he was. The king now took an opportunity of telling him that he knew all about the letter to which he had referred: that Beaton had kept a duplicate of it, that he had seen it, and that it had created no suspicions of the cardinal's loyalty. Sadler, evidently amazed, suggested that his Majesty had better look at the original, which he had in his bosom. As the cardinal was in the room, and might be observing their movements, the king told him to take it out quietly, as if it were some other paper; and then looking at it, he declared that it agreed word for word with the duplicate. It was hopeless to make anything of this, and so the ambassador, leaving it off, began to dilate upon the reformation which Henry had wrought at Christ Church, Canterbury, and upon the bad lives of the monks and friars; but the king simply smiled, and said that if they did not live well, he would amend them, and then showed a disposition to change the subject.[1]

All this, and much more, Sadler communicates to Henry with great minuteness of detail; but it was plain that the great object of his embassage had failed.

In a parliament which was held in the month of March 1541, a series of acts were passed which clearly indicate the determination of the king to root out heresy and maintain the established order of things. By one of these it was declared death to argue or impugn the Pope's authority. By another it was declared unlawful for any, except "theologians approved by famous universities, or admitted thereto by those who have lawful power," to hold conventicles in order to dispute of the Holy Scriptures, or for any one to lodge any known heretic. By a third, it was enacted that no heretic who had abjured his heresy, and been received to penance and grace, should talk to others of the holy faith, under pain of being considered as relapsed. By a fourth, it was provided that if any one were suspected of heresy, and, after being summoned, fled from justice, he should be held as guilty, and proceeded against accordingly; and that if any one should

---

[1] Sadler's State Papers and Letters, vol. i.

receive him, assist him, or petition for his pardon, he should be held as a favourer of heresy. By a fifth, it was ordained that should any one reveal a congregation or conventicle where error was disseminated, he should, in the event of his being one of the heretical congregation himself, be acquitted and absolved; and in the event of his not being so, he should be rewarded with a portion of the confiscated goods of the accused.[1] Such were the tyrannical acts by which it was attempted to prop up the papacy in our country when it was tottering to its fall.

But it was felt at the same time that the Church might be better preserved by abolishing abuses than by burning people for talking of them. Accordingly, on the same day with these other acts, an act was passed for reforming of kirks and kirkmen. In this act it is set forth, that "because the negligence of divine service, the great unhonesty in the kirk, through not making of reparation to the honour of God Almighty, and to the blessed sacrament of the altar, the Virgin Mary, and all holy saints; and also the unhonesty and misrule of kirkmen, both in wit, knowledge, and manners, is the matter and cause that the kirk and kirkmen are lightly spoken of and contemned; for remede hereof, the King's Grace exhorts and prays openly all archbishops, bishops, ordinaries, and other prelates, and every kirkman in his own degree, to reform themselves, and all kirkmen under them, in habit and manners both to God and man," etc., etc. It is worthy of remark that this act does not conclude with denouncing death and confiscation of goods against all delinquent churchmen, but simply, "if any person will not obey nor obtemper to their superior, in that behalf the King's Grace shall find remede therefor at the Pope's Holiness, and such like against the said prelates if they be negligent."[2]

These acts were hardly passed till Beaton, ever active, started on an embassage to Rome. His avowed object was to procure his appointment as papal legate to Scotland; but it is supposed he had secret instructions to negotiate an alliance with the Emperor and the King of France for the invasion of England and extirpation of heresy. The conjuncture was favourable, as Francis was now feasting and fêting his former foe, and both were equally zealous for the Catholic Church; but their old animosities were quickly renewed—Milan became once more a bone of contention, and the alliance, if ever contemplated, happily for Protestantism was never formed.

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. i.

[2] Ibid.

Meanwhile Sadler proceeded a second time to Scotland, bent on the same errand as before, and with letters in which our monarch was admonished not to be as a brute or stock in the hands of the clergy. "The practices of prelates and clerks," say the instructions, "be wondrous, and their juggling so crafty, that unless a man beware, and be as oculate as Argus, he may be lightly led by the nose, and bear the yoke, yea, and yet for blindness not to know what he doth."[1] This lecture, which was to be read by Sadler to James, lets us understand that Henry considered him as priest-ridden; and perhaps he was; but still it was not very courteous to say so in such homely phrase, notwithstanding the privilege of an uncle to say rude things to an orphan nephew.

The position of James at this period was peculiar and embarrassing. He was in need of money; and there were two ways in which he could get it, and each of these had been urged upon him. He might confiscate the property of the Church, or of the heretical gentry and nobles. Again and again Henry urged upon him the former method; Beaton and his clergy suggested the latter. The king pointed to his own example; the cardinal drew out a list of three hundred and sixty persons of property who were suspected of heresy, and whose possessions, if confiscated, would amply satisfy all the requirements of royalty. It was for James to choose whether he would break with the nobility or the clergy,—whether he would enrich himself with secular or ecclesiastical plunder. There was as much principle, or want of principle, on the one side as the other. But, if rob the king must, whom should he rob? The clergy had hitherto been his firmest friends; it was in their wisdom he most trusted; it was their talents he most employed; it was to their masses he looked for the salvation of his soul. If they were rich, they were also liberal; and they had already voluntarily assessed themselves in large sums for his support. Mary, his queen, was Catholic; France, his ancient ally, was Catholic; to spoil the Church he must break with them. Yet James was not blind to the vices of the clergy; he gave his countenance to satires upon their idle and licentious lives;[2] he passed acts to reform them;[3] and he is

---

[1] Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i.

[2] Friar Keillor's "Mystery" and Sir David Lindsay's "Satyre of the Three Estatis" were performed in his presence; and Buchanan, at the king's special desire, wrote the stinging satire on the Franciscan friars, known as Franciscanus.

[3] Act, 14th March 1541, quoted above.

said to have looked with a covetous eye upon their ample possessions, and to have meditated the appropriation of some of them. On the other hand, James had no great love for his nobility; he had more than the Stewarts' hereditary dread of their turbulence and power; and the faction of Angus had disturbed and distressed him all his life long. But to beggar nearly four hundred of them, because suspected of heresy, was a scheme too wild, too daring, too unprincipled for him. He is said to have driven from his presence the first proposer of the plan with mutterings about heading and hanging, but to have afterwards reverted to the thought, and that the terrible proscription-roll was found in his pocket after his death.[1]

We have not the same clear information in regard to Sadler's second mission which we have in regard to his first; but it would appear that James had given a qualified promise that he would meet Henry at York during his intended progress to the north. Henry came to York, and remained there during six days; but James did not appear. The clergy, it was thought, had prevailed upon him to remain at home; and perhaps they advised wisely, for there were suspicions of a trap being laid to catch the Scotch king. James sent a courteous apology; but Henry conceived himself slighted and insulted, and returned to London venting threatenings and curses against the Scotch. War was the result; the borders became the scene of bloodshed and pillage; the old Duke of Norfolk marched into Scotland with a large army, but retired at the approach of winter, and in presence of the Scotch array. The king wished a pursuit, but the barons refused to follow him, and he left the army in deep disgust. The shameful rout of Solway Moss soon followed. The high-spirited monarch could bear no more; he shut himself up in Falkland Palace, and the violence of his grief soon induced a slow fever. None could "pluck from his heart the rooted sorrow." While rapidly sinking, intelligence was brought that his queen, who was at Linlithgow, had been delivered of a girl, afterwards the unfortunate Queen Mary. "It came with a lass, and it will go with a lass," said the broken-hearted monarch, and in seven days afterwards expired.

The mysterious death of the king, free from all apparent disease, made many whisper he had been poisoned, or as Knox phrases it, that "of old 'his part was in the pot,' and

---

[1] Knox's History, book i. Sadler also mentions such a proscription-roll, vol. i.

that the suspicion thereof caused him to be inhibited the queen's company." The truth is, it was customary in those times to attribute every such death to false play, and chemical analysis could not yet either prove or disprove the popular rumours. Knox had no liking for Mary of Guise. "Howsoever the tidings liked her," said he, "she mended with as great expedition of that daughter as ever she did of any son she bore. The time of her purification was sooner than the Levitical law appoints; but she was no Jew, and therefore in that she offended not."[1]

Cardinal Beaton lost no time in producing a document purporting to be the will of the deceased monarch, appointing him regent of the kingdom during the queen's minority, with a council, consisting of the Earls of Argyll, Huntly, and Moray, to assist him in the government; and proclamation was made, accordingly, at the market-cross of Edinburgh. Instantly there were rumours afloat of a dead or dying man's hand being guided upon a blank paper, which was afterwards filled up by the cardinal himself. The circumstance was affirmed in high quarters,[2] and very generally believed; but it was never proved, nor as much as judicially alleged against the cardinal, even when he was lying in prison, and his enemies very anxious to find judicial matter against him. In the absence of proof to the contrary, all the probabilities are in favour of the genuineness of the document. James was morbidly jealous of his barons; after the mutiny of Fala Muir, and the rout of Solway, he had conceived toward them the most violent antipathy—it was the cause of his death. It was not likely he would commit the government of the kingdom to them. On the other hand, he trusted and venerated the clergy; he had all along been ruled, perhaps overridden, by them; on his death-bed, when all the powers of superstition could be brought to bear upon him, their ascendency would naturally be increased, and there was nothing more likely than that he should execute an instrument appointing his favourite Beaton regent of the kingdom.

But if the king had faith in the cardinal, the nobles had not. They assembled, and ignoring all other pretensions, appointed the Earl of Arran, the next heir to the crown after

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] Sadler says that Arran assured him of this. (State Papers, vol. i. p. 138.)

the infant Mary, to be regent.[1] He was a good-natured, somewhat feeble, and very changeable man. Successively a puppet in the hands of the opposite factions, he was trusted by neither. But, be this as it may, his elevation to the head of the government was considered a great triumph to the reformed opinions, as he was known to favour them, and had employed as his chaplains two Dominican friars, Thomas Williams and John Rough, who had acquired a reputation for their bold preaching against the errors and vices of the Established Church.

Meanwhile the intelligence of James's death reached the court at London. Henry at once determined to renew his favourite project of uniting the two crowns by a marriage between the infant queen and his son Prince Edward. The long-exiled Douglases set out on their journey to the north, bound by feeling and interest to the English king. The nobles who had been taken prisoners at the Solway, among whom were the Earls of Glencairn and Cassillis, and the Lords Maxwell, Somerville, Fleming, and Oliphant, were released from captivity, on solemnly swearing that they would use their utmost efforts to obtain the consent of the Scotch Parliament to the marriage, and the instant delivery into Henry's hands of the royal child, and the principal fortresses of the kingdom. The first proposal was politic and wise—the truest patriot might have given his approval to it; but the other two were so ignominious that no independent people could consent to them; and it is too plain that the nobles had basely agreed to purchase their own liberty by surrendering the liberty of their country.

Beaton was too able and dangerous a man to be allowed to be at large; and the first act of Arran and his friends was to get him into their power. He was known to correspond with France: this was construed into treason; the cry of a French invasion was raised; and the cardinal was hurriedly seized and committed as a prisoner to Blackness Castle. But the Church was still strong; and a result followed which probably was not anticipated. The churches were everywhere closed; no priest could be prevailed upon to say a mass, to christen an infant, or to read the service for the burial of the dead. It seemed as if the country had been placed under an interdict. Notwithstanding the prevalence of the reformed opinions, there can be

---

[1] His office and title of Governor were conferred by the first parliament that met.

no doubt but that this bold stroke of the papal party must have produced a profound impression upon a people educated in the Romish creed, and not yet emancipated from its power.[1]

On the 12th March 1543, the Three Estates assembled at Edinburgh. They wisely agreed to the marriage of Mary to Prince Edward of England; but like men who valued the freedom they had inherited, they resolved that their young queen should not pass into England till she was ten years of age, and that not one of their fortresses should be entrusted to Henry.[2] All the deliberations of the parliament on this subject were characterised by prudence and patriotism; and had it not been for the impetuosity of the English king, the union of the crowns would have been anticipated by more than half a century.

On the 15th day of the month, being the third of the session, this parliament took the first step toward the reformation of the church, by authorising the perusal of the sacred Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. It was Lord Maxwell who brought the matter before the Lords of the Articles, proposing that "it should be statute and ordained that it shall be lawful for all our sovereign lady's lieges to have the holy writ, to wit, the New Testament and Old, in the vulgar tongue, in English or Scotch, of a good and true translation, and that they shall incur no crime for the having and reading of the same," &c. Upon which the act proceeds—"The Lords of Articles being advised with the said writing, find the same reasonable; and therefore think that the same may be used among all the lieges of this realm, in our vulgar tongue, of a good, true, and just translation, because there was no law shown nor produced to the contrary; and that none of our sovereign lady's lieges incur any crime for having or reading of the same in form as said is; nor shall be accused therefore in time coming; and that no person dispute, argue, or hold opinions of the same, under the said pains contained in the foresaid acts of parliament."[3] When this bill was brought before the Estates, the Archbishop of Glasgow protested, in his own name and of all the prelates who might adhere to him, against its being passed into a law "till a provincial council should be held of all the clergy of the realm, to

---

[1] Tytler, vol. v.

[2] Keith's History, book i. chap iii. Tytler, vol. v.

[3] Acts of the Scottish Parliament, 15th March 1543. Keith's History, book i. chap. iv.

advise and conclude if the same were necessary."[1] Notwithstanding the archbishop's protest, the bill was passed; and instructions given to the Clerk of Register to make proclamation of it at the market-cross.

It will be observed that this act affirms that there was no law upon the statute-book against the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, and therefore it is simply what would now be called a declaratory act. It did not confer the privilege; it merely declared that it already existed by the law of the land. It is certain, however, that the clergy did not concede the lawfulness of every man perusing the Scriptures for himself, and to have done so prior to this period would have been construed into a crime. It is fair, however, to remark, that Archbishop Dunbar founds his protest not upon the wrongousness or illegality of the measure, but upon its Erastianism. He deprecates legislation in the parliament regarding matters which could be properly dealt with only in the councils of the Church. Most people, however, will be of opinion, that it would have been long before a convocation of ecclesiastics would have passed such a law, and will receive this measure of Church reform not the less thankfully that it emanated from State legislation.

The act, with singular inconsistency, while it allows all men to read the Bible, forbids them to form any opinion regarding it. It has been construed, however, as referring merely to opinions contrary to the authorised creed, and it has been said that even still, while all may read the Bible, they must read it according to the Church's Confession. Probably it was the fully-expressed opinion of the Anglican party in the parliament; for in England men were allowed to read the Bible, but if they there discovered anything opposed to the royal faith, the discovery cost them their head. The instant effect of the passing of the act is described by Knox, with all the freshness of one who lived at the time:—"Then," says he, "might have been seen the Bible lying almost upon every gentleman's table. The New Testament was borne about in many men's hands. We grant that some, alas! profaned that blessed Word; for some that perchance had never read ten sentences in it, had it most common in their hand; they would chop their familiars on the cheek with it, and say, this hath lain under my bed feet these ten years. Others would glory, O

---

[1] Keith's History, book i. chap. iv.

how oft have I been in danger for this book! How secretly have I stolen from my wife at midnight to read upon it! And this was done of many to make court and curry favours thereby; for all men esteemed the governor to have been one of the most fervent Protestants that was in Europe."[1]

The passing of this act was a great victory won by the Reformers, but the next scene in the changeful drama is the Earl of Arran riding to Callander, meeting with Cardinal Beaton there, proceeding with him to Stirling, going to the Church of the Franciscan Convent, making confession, doing penance, getting absolution, received back into the bosom of the Holy Catholic Church. How the cardinal had been liberated from his prison no one could well explain. How the governor had thus suddenly changed his opinions was a greater mystery still. But people noted that shortly before this his illegitimate brother, John Hamilton, Abbot of Paisley, had returned from France, and they suspected that he had exercised that mesmeric influence which strong minds always have over weak ones. There was now no place found for John Rough and Thomas Williams. Their declamations against licentious monks, the idolatry of the mass, and the invocation of saints, had lost their savour, and they were glad to flee for their lives. A coalition-government was formed, and the vigour of its measures soon showed that it was Beaton and not Arran who was its real head.

Meanwhile, a fleet of Scottish merchantmen had taken refuge in an English harbour, and, depending on the treaty of peace between the two nations, were in no hurry to depart. With the grossest injustice, Henry ordered them to be seized, and their cargoes to be confiscated and sold.[2] The mercantile classes of Scotland, now rising into importance, were incensed to the uttermost; they mobbed the house of Sadler, and threatened his life.[3] The spark was soon fanned into a flame, and the indignation was mutual. Disappointed at the conditions which the Scottish Parliament had annexed to the matrimonial alliance, Henry resolved to seek Mary for his son, with a sword in his hand—a bad way to woo a woman. War blazed forth, and the two countries were alternately ravaged. There was one new feature in these desolating campaigns. The Religious Houses, instead of being spared as hitherto, were the first to be given to the flames. The Protestants of

[1] Knox's Hist., book i.

[2] Keith, book i. chap. iii.

[3] Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. book ii.

England esteemed it peculiarly meritorious to butcher a monk, or to burn a monastery. In one foray alone, conducted by the Earl of Hertford in 1545, no fewer than seven monasteries and other Religious Houses were destroyed. Kelso, Dryburgh, Melrose, and Jedburgh were laid in ruins.[1]

Francis I. gave a cordial and effective support to Cardinal Beaton and his party; the people were divided into the French and English factions; and the contest became little better than a battle between France and England, fought upon Scottish ground. Henry was bent upon uniting Scotland to England, by obtaining possession of her queen and her fortresses. Francis saw it to be his interest, if possible, to prevent this. The Protestants looked to Henry, the Papists to Francis. Beyond all question, Popery in this case was for the nonce allied with patriotism. The clergy saw this, and made the best use of it. From pulpits, formerly silent, they uttered fierce invectives against the truckling spirit that would sell country, birthright, liberty, religion, to a brutal king, the murderer of his wives, the desolator of their fairest provinces. They met at St Andrews, raised money among themselves to carry on the war, offered to melt down the church plate, and to take the field themselves, if need were, and fight for their hearths and their altars.[2] While this loyal spirit pervaded thePapal party, the Protestant nobles were pocketing pensions from the English king, and pledging themselves to unite their banners to his for the conquest of their fatherland. The Earl of Glencairn gets £250 yearly; his son, Lord Kilmaurs, £125. The Earl of Lennox gets a still more splendid bribe—the hand of the Lady Margaret Douglas, and considerable estates in England.[3] For this they sold their country and themselves.

But we must revert to the triumphs and conflicts of Protestantism apart from State intrigues. The Earl of Arran, immediately after his apostasy, caused it to be "propounded in plane parliament," "how there is great murmurs that heretics more and more rise and spread within the realm, sowing damnable opinions, contrary to the faith and laws of Holy Kirk;" and gave exhortation to all prelates, each within his

---

[1] Haynes' State Papers. Original paper quoted by Robertson, Hist., vol. i. book ii.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 204. Tytler, vol. v.

[3] Keith's Hist., book i. chap. iii. A still more detailed account of the pensions received by the Scottish Protestant nobles will be found in Tytler's History.

own diocese, to inquire after such heretics, intimating that he, as governor, would be ready at all times to do his duty.[1] Thus armed with the whole political as well as ecclesiastical power of the kingdom, the cardinal resolved to strike terror into the Reformers by a signal example of severity. The fair city of Perth, laved by the waters of the Tay, had become noted for heresy. Thither Beaton made a progress, taking Arran along with him. A number of persons were cited before an ecclesiastical assize, and of these, six—five men and a woman—were condemned to die. Robert Lamb was charged with interrupting the preaching of a friar who was advocating the invocation of saints; William Anderson, James Ronald, and James Finlayson were indicted for nailing two ram's horns to a St Francis's head, attaching a cow's rump to his tail, and eating a goose upon All-hallow evening; James Hunter was charged with being art and part with them; and Helen Stark, the wife of James Finlayson, was accused of refusing to pray to the Virgin when in labour.[2] The men were hanged, and the poor woman was drowned, being refused the small consolation, which she earnestly desired, of dying in company with her husband.

Before this terrible example was forgotten, the celebrated martyr GEORGE WISHART was brought to the stake. Wishart belonged to the family of Pittarrow, in the Mearns. We first hear of him teaching a school at Montrose, and exhibiting his enlightened scholarship by instructing his pupils in Greek. We next find him at Bristol, where he was accused of heresy, and more especially of denying the atonement, and for this he was condemned; but he had not yet acquired the martyr's willingness to die, and so he publicly recanted, and burned his fagot in the church of St Nicolas.[3] This occurred in 1539, and in 1543 we find him at Cambridge, the interval having been spent in Germany and Switzerland. We have an interesting portraiture of him while there, given us by Emery Tylney, one of his pupils. "He was a man of tall stature, bald-headed, and on the same wore a round French cap; judged to be of melancholy complexion by his physiognomy, black-haired, long-bearded, comely of personage, well-spoken after his country of Scotland, courteous, lowly, lovely, glad to

---

[1] Keith's History, book i. chap. iv.

[2] Spottiswood's History, book ii. Knox's Hist., book i.

[3] Tytler, vol. v. Mayor's Calendar—"That Christ nother hath nor could merit for him ne yet for us.

teach, desirous to learn, and was well travelled; having on him, for his habit or clothing, never but a mantle or frieze gown to the shoes, a black millian fustian doublet and plain black hose, coarse new canvass for his shirts, and white falling bands and cuffs at his hands. All the which apparel he gave to the poor, some weekly, some monthly, some quarterly, as he liked, saving his French cap, which he kept the whole year of my being with him."[1]

A.D. 1543. In July 1543 Wishart returned to Scotland in the company of the commissioners who had gone to England to negotiate the marriage-treaty which was to unite the kingdoms.[2] He instantly began to preach the doctrines of the Reformation. Montrose and Dundee listened to his eloquence. In the latter town the populace were so excited by his invectives as to attack and destroy the convents of the Franciscan and Dominican Friars. The magistrates found themselves compelled to interfere, and Wishart was interdicted from preaching. Upon this, he retired to the western counties, where his friends were all-powerful. Lennox, Cassillis, and Glencairn were there able to defend him against all deadly, and secure him an entrance into every parish church; but to the honour of Wishart it must be told, that when any opposition was made to his preaching in the church, he refused to allow force to be used, and retired to the market-cross or the fields. He preached at Barr, Galston, Mauchline, and Ayr, generally surrounded by armed men. Hearing that the plague had broken out at Dundee, with great self-devotedness he hurried thither, and was unwearied in preaching the gospel, visiting the sick, and preparing the dying for death. While thus employed, he received a message from the Earl of Cassillis, that the gentlemen of the west wished him to meet them at Edinburgh, for the purpose of having a public disputation with the bishop. He at once obeyed the summons, and proceeded southwards, but with the melancholy feeling of St Paul when he went "bound in the spirit to Jerusalem." He knew that Cardinal Beaton was bent upon his destruction, and he was haunted by the dread of a cruel death. But now he was prepared to meet it.[3]

On reaching Edinburgh, he found his friends had not arrived, and it was thought expedient he should remain concealed for a day or two. The truth is, men were afraid both

---

[1] Quoted in Fox's Martyrology, book viii. sect. iv.

[2] Tytler, vol. v.

[3] Knox's History, book i. Tytler, vol. v.

for him and themselves. But Wishart could not bear this skulking from danger in so holy a cause, and preached at Leith; and afterwards, proceeding into East Lothian, he was entertained by the Lairds of Brunston, Longniddry, and Ormiston, who were all zealous reformers. While here, he preached at Musselburgh, Inveresk, Tranent, and Haddington. On these occasions he was surrounded by the armed retainers of his friends, and a two-handed sword was borne before him. It was here that JOHN KNOX, now in his fortieth year, attached himself to his party, and immediately obtained his confidential friendship. His office it was to bear the two-handed sword.[1] At Haddington the congregation was very small; it was plain that men's faith was failing through fear; and, conscious of his approaching doom, Wishart bid an affectionate farewell to his friends, and proceeded to Ormiston House. Knox would have accompanied him, but this Wishart would not allow. "Nay, return to your children," said he, "and God bless you. One is sufficient for a sacrifice."[2]

Meantime Cardinal Beaton had come to Edinburgh, and was there holding a synod for the correction of clerical abuses.[3] Hearing that Wishart was in the neighbourhood preaching Lutheranism, and sheltered by men whom he knew to be his deadly enemies, he resolved upon his instant apprehension. At midnight Ormiston House was surrounded by a troop of cavalry, commanded by the Earl of Bothwell. Wishart surrendered himself upon a solemn assurance from Bothwell that he would not deliver him into the hands of the cardinal, but would protect him from all harm. The pledge was violated, and the captive hurried from Ormiston to Edinburgh, and from Edinburgh to St Andrews. A convocation of the dignified clergy was called; Dunbar laid aside his ill-will to Beaton, and came; it was the old story of Herod's reconciliation with Pilate before the victim was offered up.[4] Wishart's heresy was set forth in eighteen articles; he was found guilty, and delivered to the secular power.

A.D. 1546.

On the 1st of March 1546 a scaffold was erected in the open space before the Castle of St Andrews, and faggots of dried wood were piled around it. The guns of the castle were brought to bear upon the spot, lest a rescue should be attempted, as had been threatened in the case of Hamilton. There George Wishart died. It is

---

[1] Tytler, vol. v. M'Crie's Life of Knox, Period II.

[2] Knox's History, book i.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

affirmed by some of our historians that Beaton, Dunbar, and other prelates beheld his sufferings from a balcony, and that the martyr from the midst of the flames, fixing his eyes upon the cardinal, said, "He who, in such state, from that high place, feedeth his eyes with my torments, within a few days shall be hanged out at the same window, to be seen with as much ignominy as he now leaneth there in pride."[1]

The death of Wishart produced a powerful impression all over Scotland. Some praised the cardinal for his seasonable severity; but a much greater number commiserated the fate of one so modest, so eloquent, and so good. With these expressions of sorrow there were mingled mutterings about revenge; men of birth were known to have declared at their table that there must be life for life.[2] And so it was.

On the first of March Wishart was burned. On the evening of the 28th of May, Norman and John Leslie, Kirkaldy of Grange, and James Melville of Carnbee, with a few friends and followers, entered St Andrews in different parties, and took up their abode for the night at different hostelries to avoid causing suspicion. The cardinal was known to be in his castle, to which he had lately returned from the marriage of his illegitimate daughter with the eldest son of the Earl of Crawford. This fortalice was understood to be of great strength, and at that very time extensive additions were being made to its means of defence. Situated on the rock-bound coast, and washed on three of its sides by the waves, it looked in one direction over the broad bay merging into the German Ocean, and on the other side commanded the town, with its cathedral, priory, and colleges. Early in the morning the drawbridge was lowered to admit the workmen who were employed on the fortifications, and Norman Leslie and three friends entered with them, and quietly inquired at the porter if the cardinal were astir. Kirkaldy of Grange and James Melville, with a few retainers, followed, without attracting notice; but when John Leslie and four attendants were seen approaching, the porter took alarm, and would have raised the bridge, but Leslie sprang forward, and in another instant the man was stabbed and thrown into the ditch. The workmen and servants were now led to the gate and dismissed, their

---

[1] This circumstance is narrated by Buchanan, and Lindsay of Pitscottie, and it also occurs in the modern editions of Knox's History; but it is not found in the first edition, which has led some to doubt its genuineness.

[2] Knox's History, book i.

lives being threatened if they made the slightest noise ; and in this way the castle was cleared of a hundred and fifty persons by sixteen determined men.

Meanwhile the cardinal was sleeping, but being awoke by the moving of men to and fro, he got up and inquired the cause. On being informed that the castle had been surprised and taken by the Leslies, he attempted to escape by a secret postern, but found it already secured ; he then retreated to his room, and with the assistance of his chamberlain barricaded the door ; but when a threat of fire was used, he opened it, and gave admission to the conspirators. John Leslie and a man named Peter Carmichael at once rushed upon him and stabbed him with their swords. But James Melville, strangely characterised by Knox, when describing this scene, as a man of nature most gentle and most modest, interposed and said—"This work and judgment of God, although it be secret, yet ought to be done with greater gravity ;" and then turning toward the unhappy cardinal the point of his sword, he said, "Repent thee of thy former wicked life, but especially of the shedding of the blood of that notable instrument of God, Mr George Wishart, which although the flame of fire consumed before men, yet cries it for vengeance upon thee, and we from God are sent to revenge it. For here, before my God, I protest that neither the hatred of thy person, the love of thy riches, nor the fear of any trouble thou couldest have done to me in particular, moved or moveth me to strike thee, but only because thou hast been, and remainest an obstinate enemy against Christ Jesus and His Gospel."[1] Having spoken thus, he struck him with his stog-sword ; and so the cardinal fell, the victim of a mean and mercenary conspiracy, originating as much in political as religious reasons, encouraged by a foreign potentate, and ripened by revenge.

While this bloody tragedy was being enacted in the cardinal's bedroom, the rumour had spread through St Andrews that the castle had been seized. The town-bell was rung, the magistrates and people hurried to the edge of the fosse to inquire the truth, but would not believe the conspirators when they declared to them from the walls that the cardinal was dead. Devoted to Beaton, they became clamorous, and to put an end to their cries, the murderers took the bleeding corpse, and fastening it by one leg and an arm to a sheet, they swung it over the wall, and then told the people in mockery to see

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

their god.[1] Shocked at this revolting spectacle of fallen greatness, the crowd quietly and quickly dispersed.

Through the mists of three hundred years the form of Beaton looms upon us—the greatest and the last of Rome's champions in Scotland. He fell, and the Papacy fell with him. To laud him as a religious man were idle, for he was not even moral. Forbid by his Church the enjoyments of wedlock, he lived in concubinage with Marion Ogilvy, who was seen stealing from his room on the morning of his murder;[2] and in the marriage-contract of Margaret Beaton with the Master of Crawford, he did not hesitate to designate her as his daughter.[3] But it were equally idle to deny him the praise of being a great churchman and a great statesman. As either, he reached to the highest position to which a subject might aspire; like Wolsey, he was a cardinal-primate, and all but a king; and his government was characterised by an energy, resolution, and sagacity, which overcame every difficulty, and made reluctant barons succumb before a haughty ecclesiastic. He was indeed ambitious and unscrupulous in the attainment of the objects of his ambition; but ambition is the sin of great minds. He was a persecutor, and spilt the blood of the innocent; but he did it in ignorance, believing that the safety of the Church, of which he was the head, required severe measures to be taken with the "heretics" who threatened its destruction. Tried by the maxims of the New Testament, we cannot pronounce him a good man; tried by the maxims of the world, we must pronounce him a great man.

Thus within three months the cardinal had followed the Lutheran preacher; and widely divided in life, they were now united in a violent death. But there are circumstances which lead us to believe that the threads of Wishart's and of Beaton's destiny were still more closely intertwined.

As murder will not hide, documents have been brought to light, after centuries, which prove beyond all doubt that for two years before this a conspiracy had been formed to assassinate Cardinal Beaton. On the 17th of April 1544, the Earl of Hertford transmits to King Henry a letter from Crichton of Brunston, containing a proposal on the part of the Master of Rothes and Kirkaldy of Grange, "to apprehend or slay the cardinal at some time when he shall pass through the Fife-

---

[1] Letter of James Lindsay, a Scottish spy, to his employer Lord Wharton, quoted in notes and illustrations to Tytler's History, vol. v.

[2] Knox, book i.

[3] Keith, book i.

land."[1] This letter was brought to Hertford, and by him transmitted to Henry, by a Scotchman of the name of Wishart. The conspiracy slept for a year, when we find it again agitated by the Earl of Cassillis, the friend and coadjutor of Brunston. Besides other documentary proof, there is still in existence a letter from the English privy council to the Earl of Hertford, dated May 30, 1545, which refers to a letter from the Earl of Cassillis to Mr Ralph Sadler, "containing an offer for the killing of the cardinal, if his Majesty would have it done, and would promise when it were done a reward." There was nothing for which the English monarch was more anxious, as Beaton was the great obstacle to the execution of his plans; but he did not like to give direct encouragement to the assassins, or direct promises of reward, as it might compromise his royal dignity, and all they could get was general encouragement from his ambassador, and an assurance that his Majesty "misliked not the offer." Again the conspiracy slept; for the wages of iniquity had not been stipulated, the price of blood had not been told down. But the plan was not given up. In October the Laird of Brunston is once more in communication with the English government; "hoping to God that the cardinal's proposed journey to France will be cut short," but insisting that "his Majesty must be plain with them, both what his Majesty would have them to do, and in like manner what they shall lippen to of his Majesty." Sadler in return assures him that it would be an acceptable service to God and the king to take the cardinal out of the way, and that though he could not compromise his Majesty, he could safely promise any reward that was reasonable, and would undertake to pay it himself on the execution of the act "from Christian zeal;" and finally hints that, if he were in his place, he knew what he would do "to please God and do good to his country." After this we are left in the dark; the correspondence appears to cease, or at least is not preserved.[2]

---

[1] The existence and authenticity of this letter were long questioned; but all doubts are now removed. State Papers (Henry VIII.), v. 377. Hamilton Papers, 96.

[2] The reader will find this strange mystery minutely traced in Tytler's History, both in the text and in an elaborate note appended to the fifth volume. He may also trace it in the State Papers of the period, now published in abbreviated form in the Calendars. We may feel grieved at the dark discoveries, but there is no gainsaying the evidence, and it is a weak thing to shut our eyes against historic truth, because the sight of it pains us.

But though the correspondence does not conduct us up to the very day when the deed was done, it is quite sufficient to prove that the Earl of Cassillis, the Master of Rothes, and the Lairds of Brunston and Grange had entered into a foul conspiracy to murder Beaton, and that this conspiracy was encouraged by the English monarch and the English Privy Council, who were ready to pay the assassins. If it be asked—Was George Wishart connected with it? it must be answered, there is a strong presumption that he was, though not positive and conclusive proof. It is just possible that the Wishart mentioned in the Earl of Hertford's letter may not have been the martyr, but his close intimacy at that time with every one of the conspirators leads one to suspect that he was. Beaton himself knew that his life was in danger; and it is difficult to believe that Wishart was entirely ignorant of the character and intrigues of the men with whom he was so intimately associated. We know that he lived in constant dread of the cardinal, and frequently anticipated his fate; and when at last he was apprehended, it was at Ormiston, from which one of Brunston's letter was dated, in the company of Sandilands of Calder, from whose house a second document had gone forth, and of Brunston, the chief of the intriguers; and they were all together, anxiously awaiting the coming of the Earl of Cassillis and his friends from the west. But in addition to this, we know that Wishart frequently foretold the woes that were coming upon his country, and even in the flames is said to have predicted the cardinal's death; and if so, his foreknowledge must have been the result of his admission to the councils of the conspirators and their English allies; for the same reasons which force us to deny miraculous powers to the Papal Church, must lead us to refuse them to our own.

But it will be asked—How is it possible to believe that one so saintly as the martyr of Pittarrow could enter into so murderous a plan? The difficulty of belief arises from our transferring the piety of the nineteenth to the sixteenth century—the piety of men at ease, to men oppressed by power, and by no means free of the ferocity of the feudal times. In the language of Sadler, the bloody deed was done "to please God" and "for Christian zeal," as well as for "a small sum of money." The religion of the Reformation period in Scotland was of a sterner kind than that prevailing now, modelled more after the examples of the Old Testament than according to the spirit of the New. It was accounted right to take vengeance

on oppressors; it was peculiarly the Lord's work. To hew Agag in pieces, to smite the prophets of Baal, to scatter the proud in the imaginations of their heart, was a work to which the faithful were called, and which they must not shrink from performing. This was shown by the speech of Melville before passing his sword through the body of the cardinal; it is shown in the language with which Knox records the event;[1] and it is shown by the whole history of the period. It were really more difficult to believe that Wishart could be free from these feelings, than that he should be infected by them.

CHAPTER IX.

BEFORE proceeding to narrate the last struggle between the new opinions and the old—between Protestantism rising into vigour, and Popery, strong in its antiquity, its wealth, and its legal establishment, but rapidly losing its hold on the affections of the people, we wish to pause and take a view of the Church of Scotland before its reformation—a farewell look of the stately fabric before it fell.

The papal creed had attained to nearly its present development, though it had not yet received the exact definition which it soon afterwards did from the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent. The Word of God was recognised as the rule of faith and manners; but this was held to include not only the canonical Scriptures, but the traditions of Christ and His apostles, as these were to be found in the writings of the early fathers. The Jehovah of the Jews was recognised as the God of the Christians, and the doctrine of the Trinity, obscure to the former, was made clear to the latter; but the worship and honour due to the one God was given to crosses and crucifixes, to paintings and statuary. As our papal ancestors believed in the one God, so did they believe in the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus; but they regarded the virgin-mother, the apostles, the martyrs, the saints, as intercessors too, and these, upon their bended knees, they humbly invoked. They trusted to the sacrifice made by

---

[1] Notwithstanding our admiration of Knox, we think it impossible to read his indecent jests at the cardinal's death without extreme pain and disgust; and it is too evident from the whole narrative, that he approved of and applauded the murder.

the great High Priest; but instead of regarding it as the one sacrifice made once for all, they believed that every time the mass was celebrated a new sacrifice was offered for the sins of the living and the dead. They believed in the forgiveness of sins; but instead of considering this as the free gift of divine grace, they made it result from the virtue of the sacraments as dispensed by the Church. They believed in the life everlasting; but they also believed that betwixt earth and heaven lay the yawning abyss of purgatory, where sin unrepented of must be expiated, and the soul tortured for centuries, unless relieved by the masses and prayers of the priests. They believed in the Holy Catholic Church; but they restricted its members to the Roman communion; *its* priests were held to be the only legitimate successors of the apostles; and the sacraments, as dispensed by their hands, and only theirs, were supposed to operate like a charm in purifying the soul from sin. In baptism, our nature was regenerated; in the eucharist, the bread and wine were transubstantiated into the actual body and blood of Christ; in penance, all crimes committed after the laver of baptism were pardoned; and in extreme unction, the parting spirit was so purged from human defilement as to be fit to enter into the presence of the Holy One who inhabiteth eternity.

In this creed, the true and the false, the sublime and the absurd were strangely interwoven, and it was undoubtedly the one that preserved the other, as the solid columns of the old cathedrals sustained the grotesque figures of imaginary angels and demons, monsters and men, that grinned from their corbels on the worshippers below. In so far as it places an earthly priesthood in the room of the Great High Priest, and puts the pardon of sin and the keys of paradise into their hands, it may be regarded as partly an invention of the Church to aggrandize itself, and as partly an expression of human feeling; for under all systems of faith man has shown an inveterate tendency to be pious by proxy, and to get the stated ministers of religion to pray for him, to believe for him, to make reconciliation for him. He will rather pay another to do this for him than earnestly do it himself.

In order that the faithful might worship on consecrated ground, every parish had its church, and every bishop's seat its cathedral. How noble some of these structures were their remains do still testify; but it were wrong to imagine that all the ecclesiastical buildings in Scotland were on a similarly

magnificent scale. Most of the parish churches have perished through the mere waste of time, but from those that remain—some entire, and some in ruins—we may infer that they were not in general more imposing than those which now shelter the Protestant worship.[1] To these the faithful were accustomed to resort, not to hear sermon, as with us, but to be present at the office of the mass, or some other Church-service, to say their prayers before the figure of some favourite saint, or to make confession to the priest. It would appear that then, as now, other motives than those which religion approves took people to church; for Dunbar, in his poem of the "Two Married Women and the Widow," makes his widow describe herself as repairing to church in her weeds, spreading out her book, illumined with gold, upon her knee, drawing her cloak forward on her face, and from behind it stealing glances at the knights and clerks who were at their devotions beside her.

Compare Page 203

Preaching had, in a great measure, fallen into disuse amongst the secular clergy. The parsons seldom preached; the bishops never. Kennedy of St Andrews appears to have been an exception, for it is recorded of him that he preached four times a-year in every parish in his diocese, and compelled his subordinate clergy to remain at their parish kirks, to preach the Word of God to the people, and to visit them when they were sick; and, more effectually to enforce this, he was in the habit of catechizing the parishioners, on his visitations, if they were duly instructed by the parson or vicar, if the sacraments were regularly administered, the poor sustained, and the

---

[1] Dunbar, in his vain longings for a benefice, declares that he would be content with a church thatched with heather:

> "Greit abbais grayth I nill to gather,
> But ane kirk scant coverit with hadder;
> For I of lytil wald be fane,
> Quhilk to consider is ane pane."
>
> *Poem on the World's Instabilitie.*

"We have a fervid description," says the Quarterly Review, "of the beauty of the chancel of Dollar in Clackmannanshire in 1336, but the chronicle does not conceal that the building was only of hewn oak. We know that at the same date the chancel of Edrom in the Merse was thatched with straw. Nor does there appear cause to believe that the great mass of the parish churches were in much better state, either in that age or until long after the Reformation." (Quarterly Review, June 1849.)

The First Book of Discipline confirms this, by requiring that the kirks be repaired with *thack or sclait*, chap. xv.

youth brought up in godliness.[1] Kennedy must have been a light shining in a dark place. There were not many that followed his example. But the neglect of preaching by the seculars was in some respects compensated for by the friars. They were in the constant habit of preaching to the people. The popularity of the Dominicans rested in a great measure upon their preaching. One of their names pointed to their work—they were called *fratres predicantes.* Accordingly we have frequent allusions to preaching in ante-Reformation times. Dunbar, the poet, who was brought up as a friar, boasts of having preached in the pulpit at Canterbury, and everywhere throughout England and France.[2] In 1508 we hear of a Scottish doctor expounding the Epistles of St Paul at St Paul's Cross; and in 1513 Dr West, the English ambassador, writes: "When the passion was preached, and the sermon done, the queen sent for me."[3] Sir Ralph Sadler was first introduced to Mary of Guise in the Chapel of Holyrood, where she was, with a number of her ladies, hearing a sermon in French. This was on a Friday, between nine and ten in the morning. On the Sunday following, the ambassador resorted to the palace to exhibit the geldings which Henry had sent for the acceptance of James. Again he was taken to the chapel, and again he found the queen at a sermon.[4] Before Wishart was impeached and tried, Winram, the sub-prior of St Andrews, preached a sermon upon heresy to the assembled clergy and people;[5] and in 1552, eight years before the Reformation, an act of the Scottish Parliament imposed fines upon those who should interrupt divine service and preaching of the Word of God;[6] an act which seems too plainly to intimate that the Reformers had already begun rudely to disturb the established worship.

The discourses of these monkish orators, we may well believe, were not such as would now be applauded: they embodied not the Christianity that now is, but the Christianity that then was received in the churches. They were generally

---

[1] Lyndsay's History, p. 69.

[2] In freiris weid full fairly haif I fleichit,
In it haif I in pulpet gane and preichit,
In Demtown kirk, and eik in Canterbury,
In it I past at Dover our the ferry;
Throw Picardy, and thair the peple teichit.

[3] Pinkerton, vol. ii.

[4] Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i. pp. 22-40.

[5] Knox's History, book i.

[6] Mary, parl. v. c. xvii.

filled with the legends of fabulous saints, the pains of purgatory, and the virtues of the mass. Knox makes one of his reforming preachers ridicule sermons in which cursing was too freely used. "The priest," saith he, "whose duty and office is to pray for the people, standeth up on Sunday and crieth, Ane hath lost her spurtle; there is a flail stolen from them beyond the burn; the goodwife on the other side of the gate has lost a horn spoon; God's malison and mine I give to them that knoweth of this gear and restoreth it not."[1] Such preaching as this, however homely, if the cursing were left out, might be not only pardoned but encouraged if it conduced to honesty.

After the Church-service was ended, the Sunday was not regarded as peculiarly sacred. It was common to hold markets and fairs upon it; and the rustic, after hearing mass at the altar, retired to the ale-house to sell his meal, or haggle about the price of a horse.[2] Marketing was sometimes carried on in the porch of the church, and even before the service was done.[3] In other cases, the parson followed his parishioners to the churchyard, to witness their skill in archery,[4] or join in their laughter at the frolics of Robin Hood and Little John.[5] Shops, hostelries, and places of amusement were open; and it was nothing unusual for the courts of law to sit upon a Sunday.[6] The way in which the Sunday was kept is very well illustrated by an incident already referred to. It was on a Sunday morning Sir Ralph Sadler was ordered to attend his Majesty James V. with the horses sent to him from the stud of his royal uncle of England. When the ambassador arrived he found the courtly circle in chapel, devoutly engaged; but no sooner was the service over than the horses were brought into the palace-court, and mounted by a groom; while his Majesty and his nobles from a window admired their action.

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] After the Reformation there were several acts of parliament forbidding markets or fairs to be held on Sabbath; and even before the Reformation legislation was tried, but failed.

[3] A synod shortly before the Reformation forbade this.

[4] James I., parl. i. chap. xviii., provides "That all men busk them to be archers, from ten years of age and upwards, and that in each ten pounds of land there be made bow marks, especially near to parish churches, wherein upon holydays men come, and at least shoot thrice about."

[5] The game of Robin Hood was generally celebrated on a Sunday in May.

[6] Dalzell's Cursory Remarks on "ane Book of Godly Sangs," p. 9.

Festival-days would seem to have been very generally set apart for fairs; and thus a prudent compromise was made between religion and business.[1]

After the Reformation, Acts of Parliament were passed forbidding markets to be held upon a Sunday, and discharging the people from gaming, playing, or resorting to taverns during divine service;[2] but still it would seem that the customs of the country partly continued, for long afterwards we find Acts of Parliament and Acts of Assembly levelled against them. In 1591 the General Assembly complains of the profanation of the Sabbath by Robin Hood plays.[3]

Pilgrimages to shrines of reputed sanctity were regarded as peculiarly meritorious, and constituted an important part of the piety of the times. Conspicuous among the places of pious resort was Whitehorn, where Ninian had reared his white church of stone by the waters of the Solway. But in later times this celebrated shrine was eclipsed by the Chapel of our Lady of Loretto at Musselburgh. Here were a famous image of the Virgin, and a holy hermit who pretended to work miracles. It was to this shrine that James V. made a pilgrimage from Stirling, in 1536, to secure a blessing upon his journey to France in search of a queen. But crowds of young men and women from Edinburgh were continually tripping their way to Musselburgh, more bent, as satirists affirm, upon love than devotion.[4]

Religious processions formed another conspicuous feature of the period, as they do in all papal countries in the present day. Yearly, on the 1st of September, the image of St Gile was borne through the streets of Edinburgh, with the sound of tabret, trumpet, and clarion; and the populace uncovered their heads as it passed, and the more devout went down upon their knees in the gutters. But as the reformed opinions spread, it was a common trick to break into sanctuaries and

---

[1] Fair is a corruption of feriæ, a festival-day.

[2] Jac. VI., parl. vi. chap. lxx. So early, in fact, as the reign of James IV., it was ordained that no markets or fairs should be held upon holidays, or within kirks or kirk-yards. (James IV., parl. vi. c. lxxxiii.) Legislation failed to put down a habit which had become inveterate.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 356.

[4] "I have sene pass ane marvillous multitude—
Young men and women, flingand on thair feit,
Under the forme of fenzeit sanctitude,
For till adore ane image in Laureit;
Mony came with thair marrowis for to meit," &c., &c.

LYNDSAY'S *Monarchie.*

steal away the images; and in this way St Gile was got hold of, first drowned in the North Loch, and afterwards burned. When his day came round, and his procession must be made, an image was borrowed from the Grey Friars, which the populace at once nicknamed Young St Gile. This young saint was fastened with nails upon a species of ambulance, called a *fertor*, and so wheeled down the High Street, amid friars, priests, canons, trumpeters, tapers, banners, and bagpipes—the queen regent herself walking at the head of the procession. But as the procession returned homewards, a cry got up, "Down with the idol; down with it;" and instantly the fertor was seized, and the image thrown into the mire. "Then might have been seen," says Knox, who narrates the incident with infinite satisfaction, "so sudden a fray as seldom hath been seen among that sort of men within this realm; for down go the crosses, off go the surplices, round caps corner with the crowns. The grey friars gaped, the black friars blew, the priests panted and fled, and happy was he that first got the house."[1] This was in 1558, and was probably the last time that the streets of the metropolis were perambulated by St Gile.

The Romish priesthood well knew that the multitude are pleased with spectacles; and probably they also knew that a rude populace can be most easily instructed by representations which appeal to their senses. They were therefore in the habit of occasionally exhibiting, partly for the amusement and partly for the edification of their flocks, a kind of religious dramas, called Mysteries. In these some of the striking incidents of Scripture were delineated, and acted in the manner of a play; in which the players were priests, and the *dramatis personæ* the most holy and reverend names connected with religion. They were sometimes performed in a church, but more frequently in the open air; and the audience were kept attentive for eight or nine hours, and sometimes for two or three days together, by the alternation of pious speeches, ribald conversations, and indecent scenes. Most of them would now be regarded as positively blasphemous; but they were not so regarded by our forefathers, and zealous Protestants have confessed to the profound impression produced on their mind by the passion-plays still performed at Ober Ammergau, in Bavaria, where the old custom still survives, but purified from the puerilities and irreverence of the ante-Reformation mysteries. It is impossible

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

to conceive that they were designed to turn religion into ridicule, or to treat its sanctities with levity or contempt. They were acted in all seriousness. The sense of the decorous alters with the times. Painting put forth her first effort upon Scripture incidents; and did not hesitate to pourtray the Trinity upon her canvas. The modern drama, in like manner, originated in the Church, and its first scenes were borrowed from the Bible.

But these theatricals were sometimes taken out of the hands of the clergy, and converted by the people into comic parodies upon the rites of religion. When inclined for frolic, it was not uncommon for the laity to elect some "lord of the revels, who, under the name of the Abbot of Unreason, the Boy Bishop, or the President of Fools, occupied the churches, profaned the holy places by a mock imitation of the sacred rites, and sung indecent parodies on hymns of the Church."[1] The clergy, singularly enough, tolerated these profane exhibitions, probably because they knew they occupied the attention, and afforded an outlet for the coarse humour of the populace, and were not really intended to cast dishonour on religion. We have an instance of this Saturnalian licence in 1547, when a macer of the Primate of St Andrews appeared at Borthwick with letters of excommunication against its lord, which the curate was required to publish at the service of high mass in the parish church. The inhabitants of the castle happened at the time to be engaged in the sport of acting the Abbot of Unreason. With this mock dignity at their head, they laid hold of the unhappy macer, ducked him once and again in the mill-dam, and then compelled him to eat his parchment letters, made palatable by being steeped in wine. These licensed frolics, at first deemed harmless, were afterwards persevered in by the people, as the Reformation drew near, to turn the ceremonies and officers of the Church into contempt, and this has furnished Sir Walter Scott with some of the most graphic chapters in his "Abbot."

It is difficult to ascertain the amount of personal piety which existed among our papal ancestors, and thus learn the inner life of the Church. "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." Unable in many cases to determine the piety of our most intimate friends, it is hopeless to arrive at any very definite conclusions in regard to the piety of the masses three centuries ago. It must be admitted, though with pain, that

---

[1] Sir Walter Scott. Note to the Abbot.

false objects of worship, as well as the true, are capable of exciting devotional feeling and that it is not always in the purest churches that there is most of the outward appearance of piety. The Hindu and the Moslem, after their own fashion, are as devout as the Christian ; the Romanist, when prostrate before a crucifix, may exhibit as much earnestness as the Protestant when bowing before the Father of Spirits. If we judge by external tests, and it is these only we can apply, we shall not judge harshly of the piety of our forefathers. They waited diligently upon all the rites of the Church, and they showed their sincerity by the great liberality with which they endowed its ministers. They undoubtedly lived under a sense of religion, in hope of its rewards and in fear of its punishments ; and in the letters and other documents of the period which have come down to us, there are more references to religious topics than would be found in most of the epistolary correspondence of the present day. It is impossible to refrain from lamenting that so much devotional feeling should have been wasted on worthless objects ; that virgins resplendent in tinsel and lace should have received the homage due only to Deity ; but still it is impossible to doubt but that much true piety continued to exist, notwithstanding the circumstances unfavourable to its growth, and that many prayers breathed in papal shrines from humble hearts found an echo in heaven.

The Saxon tongue has ever been fruitful in oaths. Protestantism has not been able to eradicate the evil ; but it sprung up in Roman Catholic times ; and the swearer's vocabulary was still more voluminous then than it is now. The following are a specimen of the more common forms :— By the Trinity, by God's passion, by God's wounds, by God's cross, by God's mother, by God's bread, by Him that wore the crown of thorns, by Him that *herryit* hell, by the rood, by the sacrament, by the mass, by my soul, by my thrift, by our Lady, by Allhallows, by St James, by St Michael, by St Gile, and so on by all the saints in the calendar. Such expressions as these were copiously introduced into every conversation, and do not appear to have been regarded as very improper, for they were perpetually used in the presence of the clergy without rebuke. Lyndsay's play is full of them, and it is from it that these examples have been culled.

But with the dawn of the Reformation, a change for the better appears. On the 1st of February 1551, an Act of Parliament was passed against "them that swear abominable

oaths." This curious act sets forth "that notwithstanding the oft and frequent preachings in detestation of the grievous and abominable oaths—swearing, execrations, and blasphemation of the name of God, swearing in vain by his precious blood, body, passion, and wounds, devil stick, cummer, gore, roist or riefe them, and such like ugly oaths and execrations, against the command of God, yet the same is come into such ungodly use amongst the people of this realm, both of great and small estates, that daily and hourly may be heard amongst them open blasphemation of God's name."[1] To remedy this state of things a scale of fines is framed to suit the circumstances of different defaulters. If a bishop or lord were caught swearing, he was to be mulcted in twelve pence; a baron or beneficed man in four pence, and so on. A poor man, who had nothing to pay, was to have his feet put in the stocks, and women were to be rated according to their blood or marriage. Thus did a parliament of Mary attempt to cure this unprofitable vice, before her queenly cousin of England began to box the ears of her ministers, and to swear those horrid oaths which we shudder to read.

In the absence of all statistics on the subject, it is almost as difficult to form a proper estimate of the morality as of the religion of a by-gone age. It were wrong to conclude that our ancestors were immoral, because they were Roman in their faith and rude in their manners. A country, though Catholic, may be virtuous; and it is very questionable if refinement, though it deprives vice of its grossness, robs it of its power. There is an immorality of the country and an immorality of the city. Unfortunately very little of our ancient literature is descriptive of ancient manners. Dunbar, in his "Two Married Women and the Widow," gives a horrid picture of female libertinism, but the poem is plainly a satire on the sex, and, like all other satires, is evidently stretched beyond the truth. Lyndsay, in his "Squire Meldrum," gives us some interesting pictures of home life, in which there is mingled evil with good. In some cases the morality of a country may be gathered from the spirit that pervades its literature. The poems, novels, and plays of the age of Charles II. simply mirror the existing manners; no other age could have produced them, no other generation would have read them. If we look to this test we shall find that the ante-Reformation literature of Scotland is often grossly indecent, but it does not breathe a licentious

See
Page
146

---

[1] Mary, parl. v., 1st February 1551.

spirit. Lyndsay's "Satire of the Three Estates" was acted at Linlithgow in presence of the king and his newly-wedded queen, the bishops, and a large concourse of lords and ladies; and yet it has language and scenes most abominably immodest. But this argues rather a coarseness than a dissoluteness of manners. Persons in the lower walks of life sometimes use phrases which give a shock to all our ideas of propriety; but this is very far from proving anything like impurity of feeling or incorrectness of conduct on their part. Amongst our uneducated and remote peasantry, we may find reproduced, with but slight alterations, the generations that lived three centuries ago. As there are hills among the Cordilleras where we may see assembled together the vegetations of every climate under heaven, from the sugar-cane at the base to the lichen on the highest peaks, so we may discover as contemporaneous, if we are allowed to range over sufficient space, the customs and civilisations of all the epochs embraced by history.

The ministers of religion before the Reformation were not the men to exercise the best influence upon the morals of the people. In the exercise of the Church's patronage gigantic evils had arisen, which urgently called for reform. The whole system had become rotten. We have seen the efforts made by successive monarchs to prevent the purchase of benefices at Rome. They never succeeded; the abuse continued till the very last; and a foreigner annually disposed of many of the best livings in Scotland, and by the purchase-money which he received made a country naturally poor poorer still.[1] The presentees of the king and nobles received their appointments from motives equally mean and mercenary. The livings of the Church came to be regarded just as a means of endowing a younger son, providing for a bastard, enriching a favourite, or paying the arrears of wages due to a servant.[2] In 1513 the archbishopric of St Andrews was held by a bastard son of

---

[1] Lyndsay speaks as if the practice were on the increase :—

"It is schort tyme sen ony benefice
Was sped in Rome except greit bischopries;
Bot now for ane unworthie vickarage,
Ane priest will rin to Rome in pilgrimage,
Ane carell whilk was never at the scule,
Will rin to Rome and keip ane bischopis mule,
And syne cam hame, with mony colorit crack,
With ane burden of benefices on his back."
Satyre of the Three Estaitis.

[2] "And him that gaits ane parsonage,
Thinks it a present for a page."
DUNBAR'S *Complaint.*

James IV., and in 1547 the same dignity was possessed by the bastard brother of the Earl of Arran, Governor of the Kingdom. James V., in 1538, bestowed five of the richest monasteries in Scotland on his natural children, albeit they were little better than babies; and even before this, one of them had held several benefices.[1] When such was the way in which promotion in the Church was obtained, we need not wonder that the clergy degenerated, if not in exterior accomplishments, at least in the virtues which become those who minister at the altar.

Pluralities had likewise prodigiously increased.[2] The great dignitaries of the Church set the example, and beside their bishoprics, held abbacies, priories, and parishes, for the sake of their revenues. Forman and Beaton were notorious for this. Every one grasped as many livings as he could; and if the teinds were got hold of there was little thought of the cure of souls. Another sacrilegious practice had arisen—bestowing abbacies and priories *in commendam*.[3] The commendator need not be a man of learning and piety; he need not be in holy orders at all; he drew the revenues without being able to discharge the duties of the office. If the abbot was a commendator, the prior did the work; if the prior was a commendator, the sub-prior was at hand. In a previous part of our history we have adverted to yet another evil—the appropriation of parishes, patronage, teinds, everything, by Religious Houses, who appointed a vicar to serve the cure, or perhaps had the duties perfunctorily discharged by one of their own sodality. The parish priest in this way lost much of his respectability, independence, and income, and the tenth sheaf and the tenth lamb went to fatten the useless inmates of some distant monastery. These things might be tolerated in times of mental stagnation; but it was certain that so soon as men

---

[1] Balfour's Annals. Pinkerton, vol. ii.

[2] "I knaw nocht how the Kirk is gydit,
Bot benefices ar nocht leil devydit;
Sum men hes seven, and I nocht ane,
Quilk to considder is ane pane."

DUNBAR—*World's Instabilitie.*

See also his poem, *The Fest of Benefyce.*

[3] Lyndsay stigmatizes this abuse also in his satire; but he lets the courtier get the better of the reformer when he proposes there should be an exception in favour of the blood-royal. The truth is, his patron James V. was notoriously guilty of the practice.

Of the twenty abbots and priors that sat in the parliament that effected the Reformation, fourteen were commendators. (Keith, book i. chap. xii.)

began to think, the system must perish. The tree stands stately and erect in the summer's calm, though there be rottenness at the heart; but with the first breath of the hurricane it goes crashing to the ground.

We cannot conceal, though we willingly would, the gross licentiousness of all ranks of the clergy. Denied by the stern ordinance of their Church the enjoyment of wedlock, and unable to repress the instincts of their nature, they sought relief either in systematic concubinage, or in the seduction of the wives and daughters of their parishioners. The temptation to crime was increased by the confessional, where the celebate was required to hear from the warm lips of a woman the inmost secrets of her heart and the strangest passages of her life. Accordingly, the ancient canons of the Scottish Church cautiously enjoined the confessor, when confessing a female, not to look her too often in the face. But canons were powerless, and councils strove in vain, to repress the growing immorality of the clergy. When the Bishop of Aberdeen ordered the dean and chapter of his See to hold a council to devise means for preventing the growth of heresy, the council besought his lordship "to cause the Churchmen reform their shameful lives, and remove their open concubines; and that he would have the goodness to show an example, by abstaining from the company of the gentlewoman with whom he was greatly slandered."[1] Chisholme, the last Roman Bishop of Dunblane, had both sons and daughters, to whom he sacrilegiously alienated the possessions of his See. We have already seen Beaton marrying his daughter to the Master of Crawford, and we know that his son and namesake received a grant of the lands of Baky.[2] His successor in the primacy, as Knox takes care to inform us, fell into the same sin; and so concluded the papal apostolical succession at St Andrews.

When harlotry thus occupied the high places of the Church, we need not be surprised to find it in the gloom of cloisters, and amid the seclusion of rural parishes. The poetry of the time represents the vice as all but universal. Lyndsay lashes unmercifully parish priests, monks, friars, nuns—the taint was on them all; and making all allowance for the excesses of satire, we must conclude that the clergy were not exemplars of chastity to their flocks. It may, however, be conceded that

---

[1] A copy of this document will be found in the Appendix to Dr Cook's History of the Reformation.

[2] Pinkerton, vol. ii. p. 416.

many of those clerics who lived in concubinage regarded themselves as simply evading the unnatural restrictions of their Church, and as living in true, though unlawful, wedlock. The connections they formed show that the illicit alliance was not regarded as altogether disgraceful. Archbishop Cranmer had such a secret liaison, "affirming it was better for him to have his own wife than to do like other priests, having the wives of others."[1] Bad though this was, there were fouler sores generated by the celibacy of the clergy. Before the suppression of the monasteries in England, they were visited by a royal commission, which made the most revolting revelations of all conceivable and inconceivable crimes; and though some of their statements were afterwards proved to be false, and probably the whole narrative was exaggerated to subserve the purpose in view, it is difficult to resist the conviction that many Religious Houses had become dens of iniquity. Henry pressed upon James, that unless the monks of Scotland were more holy than those of England, nowhere did there reign "more abominations than were used in cloisters among monks, canons, nuns, and friers;" but all that James would admit was contained in his answer to the ambassador: "God forbid that if a few be not good, for them all the rest should be destroyed. Though some be not, there be a great many good; and the good may be suffered, and the evil must be reformed, as ye shall hear that I shall see it redressed in Scotland, by God's grace, if I brook life." Such were the different views of monasticism entertained by the two monarchs. The one imagined it might be reformed, the other thought it only worthy to be destroyed. "Every plant," said Sadler, solemnly, "which my Father hath not planted shall be plucked up."[2]

Very different estimates have been formed of the literary attainments of the Scottish clergy prior to the Reformation. Some have maintained they were grossly ignorant, others that they were, compared with the age in which they lived, well-educated and intelligent. The difference of opinion has arisen from trying them by different standards, and having regard to different departments of literature. It must be conceded that in general they were ignorant of the contents of the Bible, and probably many of them had never once seen a copy of it. Luther was upwards of twenty, and in the convent of Erfurth, before he knew anything of the Scriptures; there he found a

---

[1] Froude's History, chap. xxxiii.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i. p. 31.

copy fastened by a chain, and began to study it. The Church had substituted the missal and breviary in the place of the Scriptures, and hundreds of the clergy knew only so much of the sacred oracles as were contained in these compilations. But it would be wrong to infer from this that they were ignorant of all theology. Unacquainted with the theology of the psalter, the gospels, and epistolary, they were versed in the theology of the missal, the pontifical, and the Hours of the blessed Virgin. Their text-books of divinity were different from ours, but their text-books they had. Their knowledge, like their faith, was that of the time.

It must be remembered that printing had not been long invented, and that books were still scarce, so that the acquirements of the ecclesiastics must in general have been confined within a narrow circle. The libraries of the monasteries, the only ones then in existence, were accounted rich if they contained a hundred volumes.[1] Nevertheless, many of our ancient clergy were well read in the scholastic and patristic divinity, and some of them had extended their acquaintance to the Latin classics. Every age produced authors of whom we need not be ashamed; and the Reformation found Lesley Official of Aberdeen, whose history of Scottish affairs does honour to himself and his order. The same period produced the classical Buchanan, and the Admirable Crichton, who astonished half the courts and universities of Europe by his learning and his logic. It may be safely concluded that the clergy in general were acquainted with the Latin tongue, and that many of them were able to write it and speak it with ease. The whole services of the Church were conducted in Latin, the whole literature of the day was contained in Latin, and therefore they must have known Latin if they knew anything. If we go beyond professional acquirements, and inquire into the general intelligence of the body, we shall find reason to believe that they were still, as a whole, the best educated and

---

[1] In the Priory of Lochleven there were but seventeen volumes. In the library of Glasgow Cathedral in 1432, we find the following catalogue of books:—1 missale, 9 missalia; 1 epistolare; 1 catholicon; 2 legenda sanctorum; 1 biblia pulchra; 7 breviaria; 5 psalteria; 7 antiphonaria; 3 gradalia; 5 processionaria; 1 collectarium; 1 ordinarium; 2 libri pontificales; and a few others. These, we are told, were distinguished by their colour, their size, the number of their volumes, or the place where they were deposited, some being chained to stalls or beside altars, and others preserved in chests or presses. See Introduction to Breviary of Aberdeen, Maitland Club Ed.

most intelligent portion of the community. It was this that enabled them so long to keep their ground. To try them by the present standard of intelligence were unfair; we must try them by the standard which then existed, we must compare them with the age in which they lived. A school-boy in the nineteenth century may know more than a doctor of divinity in the sixteenth, and yet that doctor have been perfectly worthy of his degree. "To be plain with you," says Sir Ralph Sadler, in a letter to a member of the English Privy Council, "though they (the Scottish nobles) be well-minded, and diverse others also that be of the Council and about the king, yet I see none amongst them that hath any such agility of wit, gravity, learning, or experience to set forth the same, or to take in hand the direction of things. So that the king, as far as I can perceive, is of force driven to use the bishops and his clergy as his only ministers for the direction of his realm. They be the men of art and policy that I see here; they be never out of the king's ear."[1]

But even though this be the testimony of an enemy, we must take it with some qualification, and regard it as chiefly applicable to the higher clergy, whose abilities procured them employment at court. There were prodigious disparities in the Roman Church, from the lordly prelate who rode to parliament on his ambling mule, to the starvling of a priest who mumbled obits and masses for forty merks a year. This disparity in rank produced a corresponding disparity in intelligence. The beneficed clergy, and the heads of the Religious Houses, generally belonged to good families, and frequently had the benefit of a foreign education. The monks, on the other hand, were mostly taken from the peasantry, and, as a general rule, had only such a scanty acquaintance with letters as they could acquire at the conventual school. Some of them could not read with fluency and ease.[2] Before the invention of printing the most slender intellectual acquirements, the ability to con a lesson or wield a pen, placed a wide gulph between the clergy who could perform these literary feats and the laity who could not. But the introduction of this

---

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 47.

[2] In proof of this there are not only the two satirical lines—

> "Ane carell whilk was never at the scule." (Lyndsay, quoted p. 204), and
> "The curate his creid he could not reid." (quoted p. 217),

but the Canon of the Council (quoted p. 253) enjoining the clergy to practise reading, and ordaining that those who could not do so and were under fifty should go to school and learn. The abuse of patronage created the evil.

marvellous art bridged over the gulph, by spreading education among the nobles, the barons, and the wealthier burgesses. To read and write was no longer a marvel. The clergy did not push on and maintain their distance; and the sceptre which superior knowledge had placed in their hand departed from them. In a council which met under the presidency of Archbishop Hamilton in 1549, the growth of heresy is imputed to the dissolute lives of the clergy, and their gross ignorance in all arts and sciences.[1]

The clergy were chiefly supported by their lands and tithes. They held their lands by the same titles as the lay proprietors; and though some envied them their large possessions it was only as some now envy the broad territories of the overgrown nobility. The wealth they had acquired by private bequests did not entail any burden on the general community; while the Church's tenants were notoriously the most lightly rented in the whole country. Sir Richard Maitland, in one of his poems, pours forth a lament upon the change which was felt when the lands passed into the hands of the temporal lords.[2] One should imagine that the lifting of the tithes must have been felt as a grievance, extending as they did to every conceivable kind of produce—grain, wool, milk, cheese, eggs, venison, fish, the young of animals, the multure of mills, the fruit of trees, the clearings of wood, &c., &c.[3] But Lyndsay, who rakes together every known grievance in his Satire, says little of this, so that we may conclude the tenantry had come to regard it as a part of their rent, and probably, so long as religious

---

[1] Hailes's Provincial Councils. Robertson's Concilia, Pref. cxlix.

[2] "Sum with deir ferme are herreit hail,
That wount to pay but penny maill;
Sum be thar lordis are opprest,
Put fra the land that they possest;
* * * * *
Sum commouns that has been weil stakit
Under kirkmen, are now all wrakit,
Sen that the teind and the kirklands
Came in great tempiral mennis hands," &c., &c.

Complaint againis Oppression of the Commouns—MAITLAND'S *Poems.*

Maitland is borne out by the First Book of Discipline. "With the griefe of our hearts we heare, that some gentlemen are now as cruell over their tenants as ever were the papists, requiring of them the teinds, and whatsoever they afore paid to the Kirk, so that the papistical tyranny shall only be changed into the tyranny of the lord and laird." (Chap. viii., sect. ii.)

[3] Connel on Tithes, vol. iii. pp. 17, 18—where will be found a number of extracts from the Canons of the Church of Scotland regarding tithes.

unanimity prevailed, felt a devout gratification in contributing to the maintenance of their ghostly fathers.

But there was another exaction which was universally felt as a hardship, and we cannot wonder that it was so. It was called the *corse present*. When death visited a family, the violence of grief was scarcely allowed to subside, till the parson came, and carried off the best cow and the "uppermost cloth."[1] When deprived of her husband, a widow might thus be robbed of her only remaining means of support. Lyndsay, in his play, introduces a poor man who has been bereaved successively of his father, his mother, and his wife, and who complains that on each occasion the vicar had driven away a cow; and to complete his misfortunes, the landlord had seized the grey mare, which brought a foal every year and carried coals to Edinburgh, as his *heryeild*, or fine on the death of a vassal; and now he had neither cow nor mare, and was bent on feeing counsel with his only remaining groat, and seeking remede at law. He was told, however, that he was a mad fool to think he would get redress against churchmen, or that he could escape an extortion, which, though not founded on law, could plead a long consuetude.

There was yet another way in which money was raised—by the sale of indulgences and of relics. The Pardoner perambulated the country like a hawker, selling his sealed indulgences and his mouldy bones to those who were simple enough to buy them. There were also clerke-maile, teindale, Candlemas offerings, Pasche offerings, fees for baptism and the burial of the dead, and the rich harvest which accrued for saying masses for souls in purgatory. In addition to all these sources of revenue, there was the mendicancy of the mendicant friars, and the plenty in which they lived proved that they did not beg in vain.

Such, as near as we can gather, was the state of the Church when it became evident to many that a great religious revolution was approaching. Many causes were concurring to hasten it. Ever since the days of Wickliff, there were men who, without separating from the membership of the Church, saw and grieved over its abuses, and yearned for a return to the simplicity of primitive Christianity. The seed was in the soil, and waited only a favourable season to germinate. The Reformation in Germany awakened ideas in Scotland which pointed

---

[1] The uppermost cloth seems to refer to the coverlet of the bed; but what the parson could do with his accumulation of coverlets is a mystery and a marvel. The custom was not confined to Scotland.

to reformation too. Communities strongly sympathise with each other, especially in periods of excitement. The throbbings of one heart pulsate throughout the whole system. Every vessel that crossed the German Sea brought the contagion of German heresy to our shores, for every vessel brought Bibles, theses, sermons, the "Praise of Folly" from the witty pen of Erasmus, or the "Confession of Augsburg" from the mild pen of Melancthon. The Reformation in England had a still more decided influence upon Scotland.[1] Henry used every means, both fair and foul, to induce the Scottish nation to copy the example he had set. He tempted our needy king with the prospect of enjoying the plunder of the Church, and he kept our still more needy nobles in his pay. While Angus, Cassillis, and Glencairn were in England, they had seen private gentlemen become great lords, and great lords become greater still, through their share of monastic spoil; and it is impossible to doubt, from their conduct, that their avarice prepared their minds for the reception of the principles of the Reformation. In tracing a great politico-religious movement like this, it is strange to remark how the base mingles with the noble, and vice leagues herself with virtue, and how God overrules all—making the very wrath, and selfishness, and sins of men to praise him.

Amongst the agencies employed to spread the Reform opinions, one of the most effective was poetry. The power of poetry upon a primitive people has passed into a proverb; and modern poetry had no sooner sprung into existence than she began to rail against the clergy and the Church. Dante boldly placed a pope in hell, and represented Satan as impatiently waiting the arrival of another. Chaucer let loose all his powers of laughter against the monks and friars, and his poetry was read and praised, while sermons not half so damaging would have been burned. Dunbar, though himself an ecclesiastic, did not refrain from satirising ecclesiastical abuses. In some of his minor poems he attacks the prevalence of pluralities, and the character of those who obtained Church preferments; and though envy and disappointment sharpened his shafts, it is evident they were aimed at actual objects. In his "Friars of Berwick" we have a ludicrous tale of a holy abbot who was too intimate with a farmer's wife, the exquisite humour of which must have been keenly relished by a generation disposed to enjoy a joke at delinquent churchmen.

---

[1] In Sage's Charter of Presbytery this influence is traced with great labour and learning, and we now know more than Sage did.

But Sir David Lyndsay of the Mount, though inferior to Dunbar as a poet, was the great scourge of the Roman clergy. In almost every one of his poems he has either some sly hit or some fierce assault upon them. His "Complaint of the Papingo," "Kitty's Confession," and his "Satire on the Three Estates," were specially written to turn into ridicule and bring into disgrace the whole order. The king's papingo or parrot has fallen from the top branch of a tree and is dying. Instantly she is surrounded by the pye—a canon regular, the raven—a black monk, and the gled—a holy friar. They bewail her misfortune, press upon her the need of confession, and suggest she should leave all her goods to their care, that masses may be said for her soul after she is gone. But the papingo has still enough of strength left to read them a long lecture upon the decline of the Church, and upon their greed, idleness, sensuality, and other sins. They, however, persuade her in the end to allow herself to be shrived, and to consign her body and property to their charge, and then before she is well dead they fall out among themselves about the division of the spoil. In "Kitty's Confession" we have a dialogue between the curate and a country girl at the confessional. She acknowledges herself to have violated more than one of the commandments, and when asked about heresy, she ingenuously confesses she did not know what it meant. But when further pressed if she had ever seen any English books, she acknowledged she had seen her master reading some; and there can be no doubt but that it was Tyndale's Translation of the new Testament that was referred to. The curate finally tells her she must come to his house in the evening in order to be absolved. "Kitty's Confession" is supposed to have been written in 1541, just previous to the passing of Lord Maxwell's Act allowing the Bible to be read in the vulgar tongue. The "Satire on the Three Estates" is a kind of play, and was evidently modelled after the Mysteries or Moralities which were acted in the Papal Church. The vices of all the Estates, and more especially of the spiritual, are mercilessly exposed and ridiculed; but King Correction in the end promises a thorough reformation, and after a discourse by one of the new doctors of divinity, Common Thief, Deceit, and Falsehood are hanged.

This celebrated satirical comedy was first acted at Cupar-Fife, in 1535; afterwards in the playfield at Linlithgow, by the express command of the king, on the day of Epiphany 1540; and a third time near Edinburgh, in 1554, in presence of the

queen-regent, the nobility, and a great concourse of people. The student now reads the play quietly in his closet, and he finds in it enough of pungent satire to reward his pains; but he also meets with passages which make him marvel how it was possible that such words could be spoken, and such scenes represented, in the presence of the young Mary of Guise, her maids of honour, and a mixed assemblage of princes, prelates, and nobles. It is too evident there must have been at the period a coarseness of sentiment, language, and manners among our highest classes which are now scarcely to be found amongst our lowest. In truth, such a representation would not now be tolerated by the lowest rabble in the lowest theatre.

But it is still more marvellous that a play, specially designed to degrade the clergy, by heaping upon them all possible calumnies, should have been tolerated at such a time, and acted in the presence of a monarch understood to be favourable to the Established Church. The most obvious explanation is, that it was written and acted at the request of the king, in order to lead to the reformation of the clergy, by setting their sins before their eyes,—and probably to prepare them for some legislative measures which he contemplated. Government measures are now sometimes heralded by a leader in the "Times" or an article in the "Edinburgh Review;" and though James had no such organ at his disposal, he had the poetic genius of the Lyon-King. Lyndsay entered into the service of James on the day of his nativity. He was his principal page, his sewer, cupbearer, carver, treasurer, and chief cubicular,—an office which consisted in keeping the bedclothes comfortably about the prince, and sleeping by his side. As James grew older, it was Lyndsay's duty to amuse him by bearing him on his back, making all kinds of antics, counterfeiting all kinds of beasts, and singing all kinds of songs.[1] In this way did the prince grow up under the eye of the poet till he was twelve years of age, and we know that he ever afterwards regarded him with affection. What more likely than that he should request him to satirize the clergy. James was not blind to their vices; he was bent on their reform. He wished to purify the Church, though he wished to preserve it. We know he employed his tutor, Buchanan, to lampoon the Franciscans; how much more likely that he should ask Lyndsay to lampoon the whole ecclesiastical body. We may be certain that the

---

[1] We have all this very pleasantly described in his Dreme, and also in his Complaynt.

lyon-king would not have written what he did without knowing that it would find favour with his Majesty. He was too fond of his places and pensions to do otherwise. The whole design becomes more apparent when we find that immediately after the play the king sent for some of the higher clergy and thus addressed them:—"Wherefore did my predecessors give so many lands and rents to the kirk? Was it to maintain hawks, dogs, and whores to you idle priests? The King of England burns, the King of Denmark beheads you; but I shall stick you with this whinger. Mend your ways, or I will send six of the proudest of you to England."[1] The whole thing, including this afterpiece, had evidently been preconcerted; and it heightens our ideas of the prudence and policy of the king to find him thus anxious, by the powers of satire, to correct ecclesiastical abuses, and gently prepare the way for a change.

John Wesley thought it was a pity that the devil should have all the best tunes, and accordingly he had his Methodist hymns set to some of those exquisite melodies which had hitherto been wedded to words of profane meaning. The Scottish Reformers must have cherished a similar sentiment when they compiled their "Compendious Booke of Godly and Spirituall Songs, collected out of sundrie partes of the Scripture, with Sundrie of other Ballates changed out of Prophaine Sangis for avoyding of sin and harlotrie."[2] The Romish priesthood are said, by a little change in the drapery, to have converted Pagan deities into Christian apostles. Our forefathers exhibited an equal ingenuity when, by a little change in the words, they converted these profane ballads into spiritual songs. Who was the alchymist who thus transmuted dirt into gold cannot now be discovered; but these singular productions are said to have been sung with enthusiasm by our ancestors, and to have spread amongst a people who could sing, but could not read, Reformation ideas. Their spirit proves their epoch. They breath a fierce hostility against the Romish idolatry, expose the vices of the clergy, inveigh against the pope, the cardinal, and the queen-regent, complain of cruel usage and violated treaties, and in many ways point to the period immediately preceding the Reformation. The Roman clergy were not slow to retaliate, and in this case they retaliated in a legitimate way.

---

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, pp. 63, 64. Sir William Eure in a letter to the Lord Privy Seal of England tells the same story, though slightly different. Knox also relates it.

[2] These were republished in 1801 by John Graham Dalzell, advocate.

A ballad ridiculing the Protestant faith, and the English for embracing it, was in wide circulation, and some poetic parson was reputed to be its author.[1] The Scottish nobles, who had sold themselves to Henry, were celebrated in song as having been seduced by English angels.[2] Knox himself informs us that a servant of the Bishop of Dunkeld wrote a "despiteful railing ballad against the governor and the preachers, for which he narrowly escaped hanging.[3]

These metamorphosed ballads, which, from all accounts, had such an influence in fanning the devotional feelings of our fathers, would now be regarded as nothing but parodies.[4] But though these rhymes were rude and appear to us ridiculous, our reforming ancestors sung them with enthusiasm by their firesides, and preferred them to the noble litanies of the Roman Church, because they understood them. It were wrong to disparage their piety, though we may laugh at their poetry. Deep feelings may find vent in odd utterances. But beside these hymns there was already in existence a translation of many of the psalms, and one of these Wishart sung with the

---

[1] Letter from Sir Thomas Wharton to the Lord Privy Seal of England, 23d December 1540, quoted in Dalzell's Cursory Remarks.

[2] "The Earl of Glencairn prayed me," says Sadler to Henry VIII., "to write to your Majesty and to beseech the same for the passion of God, to encourage them so much as to give them trust, for they were already commonly hated here, for your Majesty's sake, and throughout the realm called the English lords; and such ballads and songs made of them, how the English angels (coins) had corrupted them, as have not been heard." (Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 167.)

[3] Knox's History, book i.

[4] A few specimens will illustrate the religious taste of the times. There is one which shows the antiquity and transformations of a song still known :—

Quho is at my windo'? who? who?
Goe from my windo'; goe, goe,
Quha calles there, so like ane stranger?
Goe from my window, goe.

Lord I am heir, ane wratched mortall,
That for Thy mercie dois crie and call.
Unto Thee, my Lord celestiall,
See who is at my window, who, &c., &c.

This was understood to be purely devotional, but there were others which breathed a spirit of defiance to Rome.

The Paip, that pagane full of pryd,
Hee hes us blinded lang;
For where the blind the blind doe gyde,
No wonder both goe wrang.
Of all iniquitie,
Like prince and king, hee led the ring.
Hay trix, trim goe trix, under the green-wode-tree.

household of Ormiston before retiring to rest on the night on which he was seized. In general they adhere pretty closely to the sense of the original, but the versification is rough, and the language uncouth, although in some instances we have sentiments expressed with peculiar felicity.

It is difficult to determine what proportion of the nation had embraced Protestantism before it was established by law. The first proselytes must have been among the priesthood and the upper classes. The great mass of the people could not read, and must have been grossly ignorant of all religion. The Church-service was mumbled in an unknown tongue, and their few ideas about Christianity must have been inherited from their parents, derived from pictures, or picked up from the conversation of the parson, or the sermons of the friars. It must be confessed that though the Bible had been all along allowed to the people, Bibles could not have been got, and though they had been got, there would have been few able to read them. Printing not only created books, but it gradually created a reading population. We need not wonder that the first and most urgent cry of the people when light began to dawn upon them was for preachers. They would have every bishop and parson preach. It was thus only they could learn.

The blind bishop he could not preich
For playing with the lassis;
The silly frier behuifit to sleech
For almous that he assis;
The curate his creid he could not reid,
Shame fall the company.
Hay trix, trim goe trix, &c., &c.

Of Scotland well the friers of Faill,
The limmery lang has lastit,
The monks of Melrose made gude kaill,
On Fryday quhen they fastit, &c., &c.

The following is in a more playful spirit:—

God send every priest ane wife,
And every nunne a man,
That they may live that haly life,
As first the kirk began.

Sanct Peter, quhom none can reprufe,
His life in mariage led;
All gude priests quhom God did lufe,
Thair maryit wyfes had, &c., &c.

So great was the influence of these ballads that the clergy framed a canon, ordaining every ordinary to search his diocese for books of rhymes or ballads scandalizing the clergy or the Church; and in the fifth parliament of Mary an act was passed against printers printing "books concerning the faith, ballads, songs, blasphemations, rhymes, as well of Churchmen as temporal, and others, tragedies," &c., &c.

Incapable of reading, and without books to read, they could yet listen, and from the living voice of the preacher acquire knowledge. The Reformers supplied the want, and by doing so overturned the papacy.

It will at once be understood that the first proselytes to Protestantism could not be from such an ignorant population—a population that scarcely knew their right hand from their left. Accordingly all the early converts whose names have been recorded belonged either to the sacerdotal or the aristocratic caste. Almost all the nobles who were taken prisoners at the Solway Moss returned Protestants; and in an age when feudalism was still strong, the faith of the lord would naturally become the faith of the retainer. But though the Reformed opinions were gradually spreading, as the acts of the parliament regarding heresy prove, still it is probable that even so late as 1545 the bulk of the people continued attached to the ancient faith. Protestantism had allied itself with Henry and England, and Henry and England were regarded with bitter hatred by almost every Scotchman, excepting the few who had been seduced, as the taunt went, by the English angels. At the time when Cardinal Beaton was assassinated, it is evident that all St Andrews was devoted to him. Knox speaks of Edinburgh about the same period as being drowned in superstition.[1]

But during the next fifteen years it is certain the Protestant opinions made great and rapid progress among all classes of people. During the same period there was also a change in the popular feelings in regard to England. The rout of the Solway and the slaughter of Pinkie were forgotten; the presence of French garrisons in different parts of the country had led to jealousies and disputes; it was felt hurtful to the national pride to see foreign troops employed to preserve peace and punish disorders, and the populace began to clamour as anxiously for their removal as they had a few years before cried for their help. Protestantism and England now rose to the ascendant. The great crowds who attended the sermons of the Reformers, the mobs who attacked and demolished the monuments of idolatry, incline us to believe that when the Protestant confession was accepted by the parliament, it had already become the creed of the majority of the nation.

We have thus viewed the Roman Church in our country before its fall, and we shall confess that we have viewed it with

---

[1] History, book i.

feelings in which exultation has been softened by sadness; we have viewed it as we would a great though wicked city, beleaguered by armies, with its bulwarks already undermined, and a whole park of artillery pointed against its palaces, ready with the morrow's sun to vomit forth fire, destruction, and death.

CHAPTER X.

THE murder of Beaton made way for the promotion of Hamilton, Bishop of Dunkeld and Abbot of Paisley, to the primacy. He was nominated to the archbishopric by his brother the governor, elected by the canons, and readily confirmed by the Pope. But it was not so easy for him to get possession of his archiepiscopal castle. The conspirators who held it welcomed within its walls all who were in danger of their lives from their disaffection to the government or their favour for the Reformation; and it was soon sufficiently garrisoned by a band of determined men, who bid defiance to all Scotland. In the month of June, a summons was issued against the assassins, to which the Earl of Huntly, the new chancellor, appended the great seal. In the month following, after some ineffectual attempts at negotiation, the parliament, upon their non-appearance, declared them guilty of treason, and preparations were made for laying siege to their stronghold.[1] But the governor was utterly destitute of military vigour; though artillery was in use, Scotchmen had not yet learned how to employ it with skill and effect, and after several months of idle effort, little or no progress was made towards reducing the fortress.

The hopes of the besieged were centred in England; and as the sea was open to them, they despatched Kirkaldy of Grange, John Leslie, and Balnaves to Henry VIII., to solicit his assistance. Notwithstanding that the kingdoms were at peace, Henry at once promised his aid, and showed that he was in earnest by forwarding both money and victuals for the garrison. The principal assassins he rewarded with pensions; the Master of Rothes got £250, Kirkaldy of Grange £200, and others of less note got smaller sums.[2] Thus supported,

---

[1] Acts of the Scots Parliament, 1546. The Kirkmen were to be assessed for the expense of the operations.

[2] Privy Council Records, February 6th (1547). Froude's History, vol. v. p. 31.

they held out till the end of December, when an armistice was agreed upon, in which they consented to surrender the castle on procuring a free pardon and a papal absolution for the slaughter of the cardinal. This last condition they insisted upon, not from any respect they themselves had for Roman favours, but because Churchmen had maintained that no pardon could be binding for so great a crime unless it were backed by an absolution from the Pope. It soon became apparent that neither party were in earnest, and that they merely wished to gain breathing time. Arran had already despatched an envoy to France, entreating its monarch to use his influence with Henry for the preservation of the existing peace between the kingdoms, and to send him without delay some experienced engineers to assist in the reduction of the castle. The conspirators, on the other hand, despatched a messenger to Henry, declaring they had no intention of abiding by the treaty, and actually asking him to write to the Emperor that he might persuade the Pope to refuse the absolution.[1]

Meanwhile the Castilians, as the keepers of the castle were commonly called, held their fortalice, but they no longer confined themselves within its walls. They visited the town and the neighbourhood; and all history declares that they disgraced the sacred cause, of which they professed to be the champions, by brutal immorality. John Rough, formerly mentioned as chaplain to the Regent Arran before he apostatized, had already sought refuge in the castle, and had indignantly denounced the outrages upon decency committed by the garrison; but it was in vain. A man of sterner stuff, and destined to play a more conspicuous part in the history of the times, now appeared at St Andrews, and threw in his lot with the conspirators. It was John Knox.

This remarkable man, whose name has so long been a household word in Scotland, was born near the Nungate of Haddington in 1505. His parents appear to have been wealthy enough to give him a learned education, and to have early destined him for the Church, which was then the only field for ability and ambition. Having passed through the grammar school of Haddington, he was in 1522 matriculated in the University of Glasgow, where the celebrated John Mair was then regent. He appears to have taken priest's orders at an early age, and to have acted as a notary, as many of the clergy

---

[1] Tytler, vol. vi., who quotes a MS. in the State-paper Office.

then did;[1] but we are almost entirely ignorant of his history till we find him in the company of Wishart the martyr, immediately before his martyrdom. At that time, and when he entered the Castle of St Andrews, he was acting as tutor to the sons of the Lairds of Ormiston and Longniddry, and had completed his fortieth year. Was it these lairds, with their strong English proclivities, who gave to Knox's mind its future bent, and made their quiet tutor the greatest man of his day? Or was it because he was known to hold similar sentiments to their own that he was admitted to their families, and entrusted with the education of their boys? It was a strong step for the obscure ecclesiastic to take—to join the murderers of the cardinal, the desperadoes who held his castle against the government of the country; but he acted with the approval of his patrons, and carried his pupils along with him. He says he sought the Castle to escape persecution, and probably there was good cause for the Lairds of Ormiston and Longniddry wishing to have their boys in a place of temporary safety, as the former of these, at least, was probably connected with the conspiracy to assassinate the cardinal.

During the continuance of the truce, Rough had frequently preached in the parish church of St Andrews, and having uttered sentiments opposed to the Established faith, Dean Annan entered the controversial lists with him. It would appear that Rough was scarcely a match for the Dean, for Knox states that, though orthodox, he was not learned, and that accordingly he saw it needful to go to his rescue, and with his pen beat the papist from his defences.[2] This theological encounter, and Knox's well-known talents and vigour, led the leading men in the castle to resolve among themselves to call him to assume the office of a preacher of the Protestant faith. Several of them spoke to him privately of the matter, but he steadfastly resisted their solicitations, "alleging that he would not run where God had not called him, meaning that he would do nothing without a lawful vocation."[3] Failing in this way, they resolved to try another.

One day Rough ascended the pulpit and preached a sermon upon the election of ministers, of which the chief argument was, that a congregation, however small, had power, in time

---

[1] In the charter chest of Lord Haddington there is a document written out and signed by Knox in 1543. He designs himself "Minister of the Sacred Altar, and Notary by Apostolic Authority."

[2] Knox's History, book i.

[3] Ibid.

of need, to call any one in whom they discerned the gifts of God to be their minister; and that it was dangerous in any one to refuse such a call. Having established these principles, he suddenly turned to Knox, who was present, and said:—"Brother, ye shall not be offended, although that I speak unto you that which I have in charge, even from all those that are here present, which is this: In the name of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, and in the name of those who call you by my mouth, I charge you that you refuse not this holy vocation; but as ye tender the glory of God, the increase of Christ's kingdom, the edification of your brethren, and the comfort of me, whom ye understand well enough to be oppressed by the multitude of labours, that ye take upon you the public office and charge of preaching, even as ye look to avoid God's heavy displeasure, and desire He shall multiply his graces upon you." Then turning to the congregation he asked—"Was not this your charge to me? and do you not approve this vocation?" They replied with one voice—"It is, and we approve it." "Whereat the said Mr John, abashed, burst forth in most abundant tears, and withdrew himself to his chamber; his countenance and behaviour from that day till the day that he was compelled to present himself in the public place of preaching sufficiently declared the grief and trouble of his heart; for no man saw any sign of mirth in him, neither yet had he pleasure to accompany any man for many days together."[1]

Such was Knox's call and ordination to the work of the ministry. These circumstances, narrated by Knox himself, have led some historians to the conclusion[2] that up to this time he was not in orders. He first refused to preach because he had no lawful vocation to do so—a plea which he could not use had he been already ordained. He afterwards agreed to undertake the work when Rough argued that every congregation had an inherent right to call any qualified person to assume the office of their instructor—an argument which would have been wholly irrelevant if Knox had been previously set apart by episcopal hands.

We should have regarded these arguments as conclusive had we not had positive knowledge to the contrary, and a key to the apparent contradiction in a controversial tract pub-

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] Dr Cook is constrained by these circumstances to come to this conclusion. (History of Reformation, vol. i.)

lished at the time of the Reformation, while Knox was yet living, and every circumstance in his career fresh in men's memories. Ninian Wingate was schoolmaster at Linlithgow, and remaining attached to the Roman faith, he proved his devotion by challenging discussion on some of the controverted points between the Romanists and Reformers. In one of his tracts he attempts to pose John Knox in regard to the lawfulness of his call to the ministry. He argues from Romans and Hebrews that no man may take this office to himself, unless he be called thereto either by God or by men having authority to do so. If Knox pretended he was called by God, Wingate asked where was the proof of it—where were his miracles? for nothing less could prove a Divine vocation. If Knox declared he was called by men, "then," says his opponent, "he must show they had the authority to do what they did." "You must show," urges Wingate, "in which of these two ways you were ordained to the ministry, since you esteem that ordination null and wicked by which you were formerly called Sir John."[1] Here is the solution of the difficulty. Knox was in priest's orders, and therefore entitled to be addressed Sir John, but he had renounced these orders, and believed that he had no title to preach the Gospel till he received a call from a reformed congregation. The "First Book of Discipline" corroborates the fact, for there it is declared "that the Papistical priests have neither power nor authority to minister the sacraments of Jesus Christ."[2] If we add to these circumstances the positive testimony of Beza,[3] we need have no hesitation in believing that Knox was a priest of the Romish Church: but that he did not think its orders constituted him a minister of the reformed faith.

It has sometimes been affirmed that the first preachers of Protestantism in Scotland were laymen, and that from these the present Presbyterian ministers are descended. The very reverse was the case. Almost all the early Reformers had Romish orders. The Bishops of Galloway, Caithness, and

---

[1] Ninian Wingate, Tract ii., "Gif John Knox be lauchfull minister?" See also his third tract. They are to be found in the appendix to Keith's History. It need hardly be said in explanation, that the priests of the Church of Rome had "Sir" appended to their names, just as clergymen now-a-days have "Revd." Burton supposes Knox might have been deposed, but the language of Wingate forbids that supposition.

[2] Book of Discipline, chap. xvi. sect. iii.

[3] Beza—Icones.

Orkney joined the Protestants. A multitude of abbots and friars did the like. Spottiswood, the superintendent of Lothian; Winram, the superintendent of Fife; Willocks, the superintendent of the West, had all been clergymen in the Romish communion. When Protestantism was completely established, and the want of Protestant preachers sorely felt, it would appear that priests became proselytes by the score, and only too many of them were admitted into Protestant pulpits. They afterwards gave trouble, some of them by immoral lives, and some of them by heretical teaching. If Romish orders, then, be worth anything, the Church of Scotland has inherited them; and still possesses them by Episcopal-Presbyterian descent. But so little stress did the Reformers put upon episcopal descent, that they decreed in the Assembly of 1562, that bishops, like other ministers, could hold office in the Church only after being elected by the people and found qualified by the superintendent. Oh, Lucifer, son of the morning, how art thou fallen in these sad reforming times!

But though no mitred bishop had conveyed to one of our Reformers the Apostolical succession, though no one had been even ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery, no honest Presbyterian minister need question the validity of his title as a minister of the New Testament. There are only two sources from which clerical authority can proceed—the transmitted commission of the first apostles, or the will of the Christian community. Either of these theories has had its advocates. It is an article of the Roman creed, and it has been a favourite dogma of many Anglican divines, that no one can be a true minister of the word and sacraments unless he can trace his spiritual pedigree up to the apostles of our Lord. Christ, say they, gave his disciples a commission to preach and baptize; they conferred the same power upon others; and so the priestly character and office have come down by direct descent to the present day. Every clergyman in Western Europe must be able to trace his genealogy to St Peter, the chief of the apostles, and the first Bishop of Rome. Except by inheritance, there is no other way in which the status of a minister of the New Testament can be obtained. In opposition to this it is maintained by all Presbyterian, and by some Episcopal doctors, that the power of calling to the ministry lies essentially in the Christian Church itself. It is argued that under the gospel

economy there is no radical distinction between the clergy and the laity; and that ministers are merely men appointed to act as rulers and teachers in the Church. They are, in no sense, mediators with God; they have no special powers but such as the Church, as a matter of convenience, confers; and occupy no higher platform than the humblest believer. But though the vocation of ministers lies with the Church, it may, for the sake of order, be entrusted to its office-bearers. They may have committed to them by the whole community the charge of seeking out men fitted for the sacred work, and setting them apart to it. Still it is but a delegated power, which bishops or presbyteries may exercise, not from any virtue inherent in themselves, but from their position as the representatives of the Church at large. Such are the two antagonistic theories of orders; and though a compromise between them has often been attempted, there is in truth no possible middle way.

The controversy is similar to that which has been waged in regard to the right by which kings reign. Here also there have been two theories—the divine right of inheritance, and the will, expressed or understood, of the people. There are those who think, that simply because a man is his father's son he has a divine right to a throne; but this scoffing age is disposed to laugh at such assumptions, and believe that all royal power rests upon the popular will. According to this theory, whatever the form of government there are times when the ordinary rules of succession must be broken and the popular will assert itself. Such was the time when John Knox was called to the office of the ministry by the Church at St Andrews: such was the time when William of Orange was placed upon the throne.

It was not long till Knox brushed away his tears, and came forth from his chamber like a strong man rejoicing to grapple with superstition and sin. His first step showed the boldness of his genius. Mounting the pulpit of St Andrews, he undertook to prove that the Pope of Rome was the Man of Sin, the Antichrist, the Babylonish woman spoken of in Scripture. The noise of this reached the archbishop, who enjoined Winram, his sub-prior, to inquire into it. Accordingly, nine propositions, supposed to embody heresy, were collected from his sermons, and made the subject of controversy. The discussion is preserved in the pages of Knox; and when he claims the victory to himself, we may believe him, remembering the

goodness of his cause, and his undoubted powers as a logician.[1]

The success which had attended the preaching of the Reformers determined the clergy to imitate their example. It was therefore agreed that every learned man in the abbey and university should preach his Sunday about in the parish church, and that their sermons should be previously composed, in order to give as little offence as was possible. But Knox suspected the cause of this new-born zeal, and in his ministrations during the week, he "prayed to God that they should be as busy in preaching when there was more want of it than there was then." [2]

A.D. 1547. But the din of the ecclesiastical warfare was hushed by the sudden appearance in the bay of twenty-one [3] French galleys, commanded by Leo Strozzi, Prior of Capua, a Knight of Rhodes of great military renown. Two or three weeks previous to this, the papal absolution had arrived from Rome; but as it contained the clause, "we pardon the unpardonable sin," the conspirators objected to its terms, and made use of a quibble to escape from their agreement. A worse fate awaited them. The galleys took up their position in front of the castle; heavy ordnance was landed, and planted not only in the streets leading to the fortress, but on the walls of the abbey and the steeple of St Salvator's College; not a creature could move in the interior courts without being exposed to its fire; the walls began to crumble, and it became evident that it was no longer Scottish engineers who were working the guns. Meanwhile, John Knox within lifted up his prophetic voice, warning the debauched garrison that their hour was come, and that the thick walls in which they put their trust would be but egg shells; and his prediction was soon realized. Further defence soon became hopeless, and accordingly the fortress was surrendered to the admiral of the French, as the conspirators had contrived to persuade themselves that there was no lawful authority in Scotland.

After being first rifled of its treasure, the noble old castle was levelled with the ground—either from superstition, as being stained with the blood of a cardinal, or from policy, as being dangerous to the kingdom.

Historians differ in regard to the terms of the surrender,

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Some authorities say sixteen, others twenty-one—the difference is immaterial.

some affirming that the lives and liberty of the garrison were guaranteed, and others that even their lives were made to depend on the mercy of the French king. The latter is the more probable and the better supported by authorities.[1] But be this as it may, they were carried to France; some of them were placed in the galleys to tug at the oar, and others were consigned to the prisons of Rouen and its neighbourhood. Knox was compelled to labour for nineteen months as a galley-slave, but he was ultimately liberated, and not one of his associates suffered death. When we remember that the crimes in which they were implicated were murder and rebellion, we must allow that they were mercifully dealt with.

It was in the end of July 1547 that the Castle of St Andrews fell. In the January preceding Henry VIII. of England had died, and two months afterwards he was followed to the grave by his illustrious compeer Francis I. But the English monarch had bequeathed to his successor the resolution to subdue Scotland under the cloak of a marriage with its infant queen; and the Protector Somerset was already on his march to the north. At this crisis, Arran, easily alarmed, was completely stunned, as any man might be, by discovering among the papers of Balnaves, in the Castle of St Andrews, a document containing the signatures of two hundred noblemen and gentlemen who had secretly sold themselves to England, and undertaken to assist Somerset in his marriage project, perhaps ignorant that under this guise he was reviving the designs of Edward I., and bent on the entire subjugation of the kingdom.[2]

Notwithstanding these discouragements the military array of the kingdom was quickly mustered. A large number of priests and monks, knowing that the Church was in danger, joined the army, bearing a white banner, on which there was embroidered a female with dishevelled hair, kneeling before a crucifix, with the motto—"*Afflictæ Ecclesiæ ne obliviscaris.*" On the other hand, on the 8th of September the Three Estates passed an act, which, proceeding upon the preamble that "the whole body of the realm is passing forward at this time to resist our old enemies of England," ordained that the next of kin to all Churchmen who should die in battle would

---

[1] We have Lesley on the one side, and Knox on the other. Tytler quotes Anderson's MS. History as siding with Lesley. Buchanan is obscure, but he appears to confirm the truthfulness of Lesley; he says their safety was covenanted for, *in a manner*, or *under a condition*. It is plain the French admiral was in a position to dictate what terms he pleased.

[2] Tytler, vol. vi. Froude, vol. v. pp. 32-46.

have a right to their vacant benefices.[1] On the 10th of the same month the battle of Pinkie was fought—one of the most disastrous in the annals of Scotland. More than ten thousand Scotchmen on that fatal day bit the dust; and the whole country lay bleeding at the mercy of the English.

Fortunately for Scotland's independence Somerset was unable from want of resources to follow up his victory with vigour; while grief, shame, and rage rendered any alliance with England at present impossible, and threw the country more completely into the arms of France. The Protector having tried the sword, now, when it was too late, tried persuasion. In an address to the Scottish nation, he declared that England desired union and not conquest, and remarked almost in a prophetic strain, that if the Scots and English were made one by amity, "having the sea for a wall, mutual love for a garrison, and God for a defence," they might defy the world.[2] But the Scots could only think of the slaughter of Pinkie Cleugh and thirst for revenge. In June 1548 Monsieur D'Essé landed at Leith with five thousand men, "old beaten soldiers," says Balfour, "French, Italians, and Germans."[3] John Knox, as a condemned convict, worked an oar in one of the galleys which brought them over the sea. The governor joined these with five thousand more, and the allied armies were now more than able to keep their ground against the English. The French king, in his message, had solicited Mary in marriage for the Dauphin, and the Scottish Parliament readily agreed to the match, and farther resolved, in the unsettled state of the kingdom, to intrust her to his care. Four galleys quietly left Leith, and slipping round the north of Scotland by the Pentland Firth, arrived in the Clyde off Dumbarton. The Queen of Scotland, now a beautiful child in her sixth year, instantly embarked, accompanied by Lords Livingstone and Erskine, and her natural brother, James Stewart, Prior of St Andrews, at this time a youth of seventeen. There were also in her train four Maries, of like age with herself, chosen from the families of Livingstone, Seaton, Beaton, and Fleming, to be her playmates, and whose names are frequently allied with that of their royal mistress in the ancient ballads of the country. The little squadron reached Brest in safety, and Mary Stewart opened her eyes upon the beautiful land which she ever afterwards loved so well. The decision of the Parliament can hardly be blamed, but it had the effect of making the

---

[1] Acts of the Scotch Parliament—Mary, parl. iii.

[2] Holinshed's Chronicle.

[3] Annals, vol. i.

Queen of Scots already half a Frenchwoman by blood, a thorough Frenchwoman in heart.

In March 1550 a peace was concluded at Boulogne between England and France, in which Scotland was comprehended; but though war ceased, animosities remained, and rendered more difficult than ever the union of the crowns. Had it not been for the violence of Henry and Somerset, Mary, with a kingdom for her dower, must have become the wife of Edward; but as time afterwards revealed, their happiness could not have been long, and the Queen of Scotland must have been a widow in England even sooner than in France.

In the meantime the queen-mother had set her heart upon the regency, and in order to mature her schemes she set out for the court of France. Her brothers, the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Duke of Guise, if not the originators of the plot, at once perceived that its accomplishment would further their own family aggrandisement, and secure the ascendency of the French interests in Scotland, and therefore they gave it the full weight of their great authority. To dispossess the Earl of Arran by violence would have been madness, and therefore they resolved to try bribes—dazzling bribes. Panter, Bishop of Ross, and two others, were despatched to the governor, to offer him the French dukedom of Chastelherault, and to his eldest son the command of the Scots Guard in Paris, if he demitted the regency; and after considerable hesitation his consent was obtained. This great step toward dominion being made, the queen-dowager began her journey homeward, passing through England, and visiting on her way the court of Edward. The young king, amid much kindness, referred to his disappointment in regard to her daughter; but the queen-mother rejoined, that the invasion of Somerset was not the right way to woo and win a woman, and that it was only on this account the match had miscarried.[1]

Arran had promised to resign the regency, but he had since repented him of his promise. Accustomed to the power and splendours of royalty, he could not bring his mind to descend to a private station. Mary of Guise quietly "bided her time;" employed every artifice to draw the nobles to her party; kept regal state at Stirling; and at last Arran, finding the tide running strongly against him, consented to resign, on receiving an assurance of indemnity for every measure of his government, and an act of parliament securing to him the succession

[1] [illegible]

to the throne in the event of the queen dying childless.[1] On the 12th of April 1554, the solemn transference of power took place in a parliament assembled at Edinburgh; and Mary of Guise attained to the full height of her ambition, by being declared regent of the kingdom.

But we must retrace our steps for a few years, and follow the current of ecclesiastical events. It was plain that the tide was now steadily setting in toward a reformation. On the 19th March 1547, the clergy presented a supplication to the governor and council, complaining of the increase of heresy, the contempt of the sacrament of the altar, the return of persons who had been banished for their faith, and the open preaching of opinions opposed to the Established Church; and praying that steps should be taken to remedy the evil. In compliance with this supplication, the council ordained that the clergy should report to the governor all such as had relapsed or were suspected of heresy, in order that the laws of the realm might be put into execution upon them.[2]

In 1549 a council was held in the Blackfriar's Church, Edinburgh, under the presidency of Archbishop Hamilton. The pressure of the times caused a great gathering—six bishops, two vicars-general, fourteen abbots, priors or commendators, besides doctors, provosts, archdeacons, deans, and others—in all some sixty persons. Among them was the prior of St Andrews—then only eighteen years of age—destined to be the leader of the Reformation and the regent of the kingdom. There were there also Robert Reid, Quintin Kennedy, John Winram, and John Mair—all men of note. It passed no fewer than sixty-eight canons, which let in the light of day on a sad state of things. The very first of them makes it plain that large numbers both of the higher and inferior clergy were celibate only in name; they had concubines and families living openly with them in their episcopal palaces and manses, and they were in the habit of making provision for these out of the Church's lands and revenues. The council forbade this in the words of the Council of Basle, perhaps to turn away the sharp edge of the condemnation from themselves, and to show they were no worse than others. Canons were also framed to promote the better education and more decent behaviour of the clergy, pro-

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. v.

[2] Keith, book i. chap. vi. Robertson's Concilia, pref. cxlvi. In June 1546, an act of Privy Council was passed against the demolition or plundering of churches or Churchmen's houses. The necessity for the act proves

viding among other things that they should cleanly shave their faces and crowns, wear ecclesiastical garments, and put off their hats when engaged in divine service. Pluralities were to be limited, preaching enforced. It was to be usually expository and catechetical; and, in some cases, argumentative and denunciatory against the new doctrines. No doubt a reforming synod, but it could not move faster than Rome and Trent! At the same time diligent inquisition was to be made for all heretics, and for their railing ballads and books.[1]

A.D. 1550. It was not long after the dispersion of this council when Adam Wallace, who appears to have succeeded Knox as tutor at Ormiston,[2] was apprehended at Winton, and brought to his trial in the Church of the Blackfriars in Edinburgh. Among his judges, besides the Governor and Chancellor, we are surprised to find the Earls of Argyll, Angus, and Glencairn.[3] He was accused of usurping the office of a preacher; of baptising one of his own children; of denying purgatory; of maintaining that prayers to the saints and for the dead were superstitious: of calling the mass an idolatrous service; and of affirming that the bread and wine used in the sacrament continued bread and wine, notwithstanding their consecration. The poor man was found guilty, given over to the Justice-Deputy, and burned the next day on the Castle-hill.

It was in the same year in which Wallace was burned that an amusing controversy arose among the Churchmen in regard to the Pater-noster—whether it should be said to God only, or whether it might also be said to the saints. A certain friar had stretched his ingenuity to show that everyone of its petitions might, in a sense, be addressed to the saints; but when he came to "Give us this day our daily bread," his gloss was so absurd as to throw his audience into laughter. He was rewarded for his pains with the soubriquet of Friar Paternoster. But the dispute was not thus easily to be settled; it set the whole University of St Andrews in a flame. The doctors assembled in solemn conclave to decide the matter. The fine distinctions of the schoolmen were called into requisition; and some held that the Pater-noster was said to God

---

[1] Robertson's Concilia, vol. ii. pp. 81-127.

[2] "He frequented," says Knox, "the company of the Lady Ormiston, for the instruction of her children, during the trouble of her husband, who was then banished." (History, book i.)

[3] Knox's History, book i. Knox states that Glencairn said to the Bishop of Orkney and others that *sat near him*, that he protested against Wallace being put to death. This whispered protest does not redeem his consistency

formaliter, and to saints *materialiter;* others, that it ought to be said to God *principaliter*, and to saints *minus principaliter;* a third party would have it *ultimate* and *non-ultimate;* a fourth, *primario* and *secundario;* but the majority declared that it should be said to God *capiendo stricte*, and to saints *capiendo large*. Still, the division of sentiment was so great and so strong that it was resolved to refer the whole matter to the provincial synod, which was cited to meet at Edinburgh in January 1552. In the meantime, the valet of the sub-prior, in putting his master to bed, took the liberty of asking what was the nature of the question which had so irritated the university and the Church. "We cannot agree, Tom," said the sub-prior, "to whom the Pater-noster should be said." "To whom should it be said but unto God?" said Tom, "Then what shall we do with the saints?" rejoined his master. "Give them Aves and Credos enough," replied the theological valet, "and that may suffice them." [1]

When the synod convened, the controversy was again stirred: and the vote being taken, it carried that the Pater-noster might be said to the saints. The bishops, however, and some ecclesiastics more prudent than their brethren, interfered to prevent the decision being registered in this unqualified shape, and directed the sub-prior, on his return to St Andrews, to teach that the Pater-noster *ought to be said to God, yet so that the saints ought also to be invocated.*[2]

In January 1552 (1551 O.S.) this Synod met. In profound ignorance of what was passing around them, the ecclesiastics congratulated themselves that heresy was nearly stamped out, but confessing the want of education on the part of the clergy, and impelled by the universal clamour for instruction in the Scotch tongue, order was taken for publishing a Catechism in the vernacular, containing a summary of Christian doctrine; and the clergy were enjoined to read a part of it every Sunday and holiday to the people, when there was no sermon. It was accordingly printed, as the colophon bears, at St Andrews, in August 1552, by command and at the expense of Archbishop Hamilton, whose composition it is thought by some to be, while others attribute it to John Winram. It is a Catechetical Treatise rather than a Catechism,

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. ii.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. ii. Hailes's Provincial Councils, pp. 36-7. There is no such canon in the Synod of 1551-52, but in the Synod of 1549 there was a canon regarding the Pater Noster, which after a few words ends in a blank. Robertson's Concilia, vol. ii. p. 121.

in the modern sense of the term.[1] It consists of an exposition of the Commandments, the Creed, the Sacraments, and the Lord's Prayer. It would appear, from the canon authorising its publication, that it was designed, not for circulation among the people, but to assist the clergy in conducting the church services, and in communicating to their hearers some knowledge of religion. They were accordingly ordered to exercise themselves daily in the reading of it, lest by stammering or breaking down altogether, they should make sport for their hearers; and they were to be equally on their guard against reading it languidly or with yawning, but rather with such vigour of voice, facial expression and gestures, as should make the deepest impression on the people.[2] From the eighth canon of this council it appears that a very small proportion of the population attended mass upon the Sundays, still fewer on the festivals, and that of those who came to church, some behaved irreverently, while others busied themselves with making bargains in the porch. It was like the time of which Pliny wrote, when in the great province of Bithynia so few were found to purchase the victims and present themselves at the sacrifices. The old religion was losing its hold, and all the superficial reforms of the synod could not restore its lost power. As Lord Hailes remarks, "when a house is in flames, it is vain to draw up regulations for the bridling of joists or the sweeping of chimneys."[3] Was the church to be saved by the priests shaving their chins, cheeks, and crowns? or reading a catechism, arrayed in surplice and stole, but with difficulty spelling out the words as they went along, amid the jibes and jeers of the people?

---

[1] The title of this significant publication is "The Catechisme: that is to say, ane Comone and Catholick instruction of the Christine people in materis of our Catholick faith and religioun, quilk na gud Christin man or woman suld misknaw: set forth be ye maist reverend father in God, Johne, Archbishop of Sanct Androis, Legatnait and Primat of ye Kirk of Scotland, in his provincial counsal, halden at Edinburgh the xxvi day of Januarie 1551, with the advice and counsall of the Bischoppis and other prelatis, with doctoris of theologie and canon law of the said realme of Scotland present for the tyme." On the back of the title-page there is an admonition by the Archbishop to the "Vicars and Curattis of his Diocyce," "to have yis Catechisme usit and reid to their parishionours insteid of preching, quhil God of his gudnes provide ane sufficient noumer of Catholyk and abil prechouris quilk sall be within few yeiris, as we traist in God."

[2] Robertson's Concilia, vol. ii. p. 138.

[3] Hailes's Provincial Councils, pp. 29-37. To the council of 1551 we owe the establishment of registers of proclamations of banns, and baptisms.

In the acts of the parliament of 1551 we have some indications of the course of events. There are two acts against those who had sustained the process of cursing or excommunication. They were but resuscitations of acts formerly passed in the reign of James V. From the terms of these we learn that the Church had put its bann upon great numbers who were suspected of heresy; that some of these had quietly continued under the curse, without any attempt to remove it, and that others had defiantly frequented the church, and even come to the altar, notwithstanding the excommunication under which they lay. To put an end to this state of things, the law interfered, and threatened confiscation of goods against all who remained under excommunication for more than a year, or who desecrated the sacraments or disturbed the faithful while the curse of the Church was still upon them.[1]

But there is another act, still more ominous; it is anent them that disturb the kirk during the time of divine service. The statute is directed against all "who contemptuously make perturbation in the kirk in the time of divine service and preaching of the Word of God, preventing the same from being heard and seen by the devout people, and will not desist therefrom for any monition that the churchmen may use."[2] The passing of such an act sufficiently proves the prevalence of the practice to which it refers, and he must have a strangely one-sided notion of toleration who does not think that it was properly put down by the strong hand of the law. The act, after specifying different penalties for different classes of offenders, from the prelate and earl down to the "poor folks that have no goods," and who are ordained to be imprisoned for fifteen days, and fed on bread and water, concludes with directing deans of guild, kirk-masters, and rulers, "gar leische bairnes that perturbis the kirk in manner foresaid." A singular commentary on this finishing enactment is found in a passage at the very commencement of Row's "History of the Church." He narrates that when a friar was preaching in Perth, on a Sunday in Lent, he was suddenly assailed by the hissing of all the boys of the grammar-school who were present. A complaint being made to the magistrates, the rector searched out the ring-leaders of the tumult, and when he was about to chastise a culprit, the urchin produced as his apology Lyndsay's "Satire of the Three Estates." Such a boy in our day would

---

[1] Mary, parl. iv., 29th May 1551; parl. v., 1st February 1552. James V., parl. iv., 7th June 1535.

[2] Mary, parl. v., 1st Feb. 1552.

be doubly whipped—whipped for possessing a book so grossly indecent, and whipped for disturbing any one, though he were a Mahometan or a Hindu, in the midst of his devotions.

Another act was passed to restrain the liberty of the press, already become turbulent and troublesome. It sets forth that divers printers were daily printing books concerning the faith, ballads, songs, blasphemies, and rhymes, both of churchmen and laymen; and therefore ordains that no printer "presume, attempt, or take in hand" to print any book, without first obtaining the necessary licence.[1] Thus early was the infant press put into irons. Shut out from the pulpit, the Reformers must have found it to be their most powerful auxiliary, speaking as it did with a voice which echoed from shore to shore. No marvel the frightened ecclesiastics attempted to gag it.

While tracing the legislation with which the Church fenced herself round before her fall, we may refer to yet another act passed in the year 1555. It is aimed at "diverse insolent and evil-given persons, who, not regarding the law of God and the constitution of the holy Church, but in high contempt thereof, and to the great slander of the Christian people, eat flesh in Lent, and on other forbidden days."[2] All such lovers of flesh and despisers of the Church were made liable to the confiscation of their moveable goods, and if they had no goods to be confiscated, they might be imprisoned for a year and a day, and trained during that period to abstinence. It is easy to perceive that the constitutions of the clergy were beginning to break down under the popular pressure. Men were laughing at Lent; and doubting the virtue of fasting on a Friday.

On the 6th of July 1553, Edward VI. of England untimely died, at the early age of sixteen. He was a sickly, but an amiable and intelligent boy, and had he lived a few years longer, a more complete reformation would have been effected in England. He was succeeded on the throne by his sister Mary, a bigoted Roman Catholic, who determined to restore the ancient order of things, and whose persecutions have gained for her with posterity the unenviable epithet of "bloody." With such a woman on the throne of England, and a member of the house of Guise wielding the sceptre of Scotland, Protestantism had much to fear. But light sprang out of darkness. It was the present policy of Mary of Guise to conciliate the adherents of the Reformed faith; and when the fires of Smithfield were lighted, "they that were scattered

---

[1] Mary, parl. iv., 1st Feb. 1551.

[2] Mary, parl. vi., 20th June 1555.

abroad went everywhere preaching the Word,"[1] as they had done once before when a persecution arose at Jerusalem. Many refugees from England sought shelter in Scotland. Among these was William Harlaw, originally a tailor in the Canongate of Edinburgh, but whose zeal had led him to become a preacher of the Reformation. While Edward lived he had laboured in England, but now he returned to his native country, and though he had little learning, he must have had talents and force of character, for he commanded influence and respect. Another was John Willock, a Franciscan friar, who had embraced Protestantism, and become chaplain to the Duke of Suffolk. On the accession of Mary he had fled to Friesland, where he practised medicine, and became favourably known to the duchess, by whom he was sent in 1554, and again in 1555, on missions to the queen-regent. On the last occasion he fixed his abode in Scotland, and became one of the most useful and honoured of the Reforming ministers.

But in the minds of the people the Reformation in Scotland is centred in but one man, and that man now once more appeared upon the stage. When we last parted with Knox he was a convict on board a French galley, bound with a chain to a bench in the hold, toiling at an oar side by side with thieves and murderers. Sometimes he lay on the quiet waters of the Loire, and at other times he was tossed by the incessant jumble of the German Ocean; and once, while riding off the coast, between the Friths of Forth and Tay, observing the movements of the English fleet, he could distinctly see the shores of his native land, and the tall steeple of St Andrews, associated in his mind with so much that was sacred, and with those stirring scenes in which he had been an actor. On the conclusion of peace, and at the intercession of Edward of England, he was set at liberty, after a captivity of more than a year and a half, emaciated in body, but unshaken in mind.[2] With his native country barred against him, he landed in England, and acted as a minister in the English Church, first at Berwick, and afterwards at Newcastle, and when thus

---

[1] Acts of the Apostles, chap. viii. ver. 4.

[2] "I have at your request," said the French king to Mason, "set at liberty the Scots which else, by yon sun, should have rotted in their prisons, so cruel was their murder. By my troth I cannot tell how to answer the world for lack of justice." Mason to the council, July 20th (1550), MS. France, bundle 9, State Paper Office. Froude, vol. v. p. 306.

employed he wooed his wife, Marjory Bowes. He was afterwards chosen one of the chaplains to Edward VI., and being consulted about the Book of Common Prayer, which was undergoing a revision, he had sufficient influence to procure an important change in the communion office, "taking away the round clipped god, wherein standeth all the holiness of the papists," and substituting common bread. The Articles of Religion were also revised by his pen previous to their ratification by parliament. Thus he played an important part in the English Reformation. In consideration of his services he was offered the living of All-Hallows in London, and afterwards the bishopric of Rochester;[1] but he declined them both, as the English Church had not yet attained to his standard of purity. The accession of Mary compelled him to flee for his life, with less than ten groats in his pocket. Setting sail for the Continent, he landed at Dieppe on the 28th January 1554.

After some wanderings among the Helvetian churches, he settled at Geneva. Here was John Calvin, now at the very height of his reputation, and with him Knox soon formed a strict intimacy. It is pleasing to think of these two great Reformers walking together in the garden surrounding the house provided for Calvin by the State, where was a commanding view of the Leman Lake, and a magnificent background of Alpine peaks. Though animated by the same spirit, and holding the same views, they were very unlike. Knox was a rough, unbending, impetuous man, but withal fond of fun, and full of humour. Calvin was calm, severe, often irritable, but never impassioned; rising in pure intellect above all his compeers, like Mont Blanc among the mountains touching the very heavens, yet shrouded in eternal snows. There is no doubt but that Calvin exercised a great influence upon the mind of Knox. Knox, though the older of the two, was but beginning his work; Calvin's work was done. Knox was but rising into fame; Calvin was giving laws to a large section of Christendom.

Knox left Geneva to take the charge of a congregation of English refugees at Frankfort, but he had scarcely entered

---

[1] "Northumberland offered it that he might be 'as a whetstone to quicken the Archbishop of Canterbury, whereof he had need'; and also to put an end to Knox's administrations in the north where he had habitually disobeyed the Act of Uniformity, and cared not to conceal his objections to the Prayer Book. Knox would not accept, and in a sermon he afterwards preached before the Court, spoke out his mind very plainly about Court and Church." Froude, vol v. p. 475.

upon his duties when dissensions arose in regard to the use of a liturgy. When things were in this state, Dr Cox, who had been preceptor to Edward VI., arrived from England, and coming to church during service, he and some friends began to give audible responses to the prayers. Requested to desist, they declined to do so, and on the succeeding Sunday one of them managed to get admission to the pulpit and read the litany. Knox could not stand this, and preached one of his characteristic sermons against the innovators. Religious rancour increased instead of abating. Knox was maliciously accused of treason against the Emperor and his daughter-in-law the Queen of England (inasmuch as he had called the one little inferior to Nero, and the other more cruel than Jezebel); and to escape trouble he was glad to quit Frankfort, and retire to his retreat on the shores of Lake Leman.

But now a longing to visit home came upon the exile. His mother-in-law had frequently written him to return; the Reformation in Scotland was making progress, a leading man was wanted, and so he set his face homewards. He arrived toward the end of the harvest 1555, and after solacing himself for a few days at Berwick with his wife and his wife's relatives, he repaired privately to Edinburgh. Here he was entertained by a pious citizen of the name of Syme.[1] In his house the friends of the Reformation were accustomed to meet, and talk over their prospects and plans with the pale-faced, long-bearded man, whom they already acknowledged as their chief. A question arose which must be discussed and determined, for it affected the conduct of many of the Reformers. These, notwithstanding their Protestant principles, were accustomed still to go to the mass, and outwardly to conform themselves to the established religion. Knox lifted up his voice against this as a sinful compromise. He denounced it as a wicked compliance with an idolatrous practice. The matter began to be agitated from man to man, and Erskine of Dun, to set the subject at rest, invited some leading men to supper, that in their presence the subject might be debated and decided. The chief opponent of Knox was young Maitland of Lethington, already distinguished for his acuteness and subtlety. Maitland defended the practice as expedient in the circumstances in which they were placed, and quoted the instance of Paul resorting to the temple to pay his vow in company with Jews still unconverted. Knox answered that the temple service was of divine origin, and that the mass was not; but further, he

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

boldly declared his doubt of the propriety of Paul having done as he did. No good came of it, but rather evil.[1]

Maitland was candid enough to confess that Knox had the best of the argument, and so he had. In such times and circumstances very little is to be gained by compromises. The character and future career of both disputants is wonderfully brought out in this quiet disputation at the supper-table of Erskine of Dun. We see on the one side the inflexible Reformer, regardless alike of fear and of favour, never content with half-measures, crying, "Come out of her, and be ye separate." On the other side sits the clear-headed, quick-eyed secretary, bending to expediency, keeping friends with all, making the most of everything. The results of the controversy were important. The Reformers henceforward refrained from going to mass or taking any part in the Church-services, and it would appear that so numerous were they that the priests at once perceived their desertion.[2] The separation from the Established Church had already taken place.

Among the nobles who at this time attached themselves to Knox, attending his sermons and helping him in his work, were the Earl of Glencairn, Lord Lorn, and the Prior of St Andrews, afterwards the celebrated Regent Moray. With these at his side, the Reformer need fear no evil. During the winter of 1555-6 he was indefatigable in preaching, not only in the capital, but in the provinces. Repairing to Kyle and Cunningham, where Glencairn was omnipotent, he preached the doctrines of the Reformation, as Wishart had done before him. Under the shield of Erskine of Dun he preached in Angusshire. At Finlaystone-house, at Easter, and in several other baronial houses afterwards, he administered the sacrament of the Supper, in the simple yet impressive manner in which it is now administered in the Scotch Church.[3] Rumours of all this flew through the country, and the clergy became alarmed. Here was a bold man doing a bold thing, and he must be quieted. Counsel was taken, an indictment prepared,

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Knox's History, book i. It is possible, but by no means certain, that he used either the Genevan Book of Common Order, or the Liturgy of Edward VI., on these occasions. Ninian Wingate, in his second Tract, says upbraidingly :—"Quhy cover ze zour table with a quhyte clayth at zour communioun? Quhy cause ze utheris than the minister partlie to distribut zour breid and wyne? Quhy mak ze zour communioun afoir dennar? Quhy use ze at zour communion now four, now three coupis and mony breids?" At Findlaystone House a pair of silver candlesticks inverted were used as cups at the first communion.

and the heretical preacher cited to appear at the Church of the Blackfriars in Edinburgh, and answer for his conduct. Knox felt himself strong enough to obey, and his friends began to muster in the city, in order to be present at the trial, and see justice done. On the Saturday preceding the day fixed for the trial the summons was withdrawn, on the pretext that it was found to be informal, but it was shrewdly suspected that the stout face of the reformer and his friends had intimidated the bishops, and led them to sist procedure.

Knox was resolved to take advantage of his position, and not retire from Edinburgh without striking a blow. On the very day on which he should have stood at the bar as a culprit, he ascended the pulpit and preached to the largest audience he had ever addressed.[1] At a subsequent meeting, held at night, the Earl Marischal was present, and was so impressed by the Reformer's eloquence that he joined with Glencairn in urging him to write a letter to the queen-regent, exhorting her not merely to protect the preachers, but to give heed to their doctrine. The letter was written, and presented by Glencairn. Mary of Guise read it, kept it in her possession for a day or two, and then handed it to the Archbishop of Glasgow, with a smile and a jest, saying, "Please you, my lord, to read a pasquil."[2] The matter shortly became too serious for jesting.

While the Reformation was thus making steady progress, Knox received an urgent letter from the English Church at Geneva commanding him as their chosen pastor to come to them, and he resolved to go. Argyll and others strongly urged him to remain in Scotland, where he was so much required; but he would be gone, and despatched his wife and mother-in-law before him, as if he did not mean soon to return.[3] His conduct in this instance is difficult to account for, and has perplexed all his apologists. Why should he leave his native country, where the Reformation dawn was steadily advancing to the perfect day, to take the charge of an obscure congregation of refugees in a foreign city? Perhaps the genial climate of Geneva, and quiet walks by its blue lake with the high-browed Calvin, allured him. In the midst of din and agitation, men often yearn for seclusion. It is much more probable, however, that he took advantage of the call from Geneva to escape from danger. The clergy had deserted the diet in

---

[1] Knox's History, book, i.

[2] Ibid.

[3] He said to Argyll when pressed, "that if God blessed these small beginnings, and if that they continued in godliness, whensoever they pleased to command him, they should find him obedient." (History, book i.)

May, but it was not at all likely they had entirely abandoned the idea of destroying one whose destruction was essential to their own safety. Both M'Crie and Tytler are of opinion that Knox fled to save his life. M'Crie recognises the finger of Providence in this passage of his history, preserving him for happier days. Tytler charges him with something like cowardice, using the language of the martyr, but lacking the spirit.[1] He forgets that in many cases "discretion is the better part of valour," and that he is but a fool who is too solicitous for the martyr's crown. If Knox was really in danger of his life, he was right to flee; if he was no longer able to beard the bishops, he was wise to get out of their way. The safety of his friends was not compromised by his departure. He was the marked man, and before we brand him as a coward we must hold that retreat is in no case allowable.

Knox was no sooner gone than a summons was issued against him. As the criminal on this occasion did not appear at the bar, the bishops occupied the bench. He was convicted of heresy, condemned, and burned in effigy at the market-cross of Edinburgh. The whole affair was a foolish bravado, which might as well have been spared. When the report of it reached the Reformer at Geneva, he wrote his "Appellation from the cruel and unjust sentence of the false bishops and clergy of Scotland." These different events were crowded within a short space. Scarcely nine months had elapsed since Knox's arrival from the continent, and only two since he was able to brave the Church instead of standing as a criminal at its bar. There had been a recoil.

But though Knox's voice was no longer heard sternly denouncing idolatry, Scotland was not left without witnesses for the truth. John Douglas, a Carmelite friar, forsaking his order, became chaplain to the Earl of Argyll, and preached even at court against the prevailing superstitions.[2] Paul Methven, originally a baker, exercised a powerful influence upon Dundee. Others of less note laboured in other parts of the country. To put an end to this, the queen-regent, at the instigation of the clergy, issued a proclamation, citing them to appear and answer for their conduct. They prepared to obey, and their friends began to crowd toward Edinburgh. Dreading a tumult, the regent made proclamation that all who had come to the city without the express permission of the authori-

---

[1] History, vol. vi.

[2] Knox's History, book i. Keith, book i. chap. vi.

tics should resort to the borders, and remain there for fifteen days. As the gentlemen of the west had just returned from border duty, they were in no humour to obey, and tumultuously forced themselves into the presence of the regent at the palace. When she would vindicate her proclamation, Chalmers of Gadgirth stepped forward, and in no very courtly style said, "We know, madam, that this is the device of the bishops who stand by you; we avow to God we shall make a day of it. They oppress us and our tenants for feeding of their idle bellies; they trouble our preachers, and would murder them and us; shall we suffer this any longer? No, madam, it shall not be."[1] And therewith every man put on his steel bonnet, and began to finger about the hilt of his sword. The queen was intimidated, as she well might be, and was glad to get rid of the threatening barons by promising that their preachers would no more be disturbed.

To this outburst of feudal independence there succeeded a period of tranquillity, and the nobles who favoured the Reformation resolved to recall Knox from Geneva. Accordingly they directed a letter to him, in which they spoke of "their godly thirst for his presence, and declared themselves ready to jeopard their lives and goods for advancing the glory of God." They informed him that the magistracy was much in the same state as when he left the country, but that no cruelty had been used against them, and that the friars were every day held in less estimation by the queen and the nobility. This letter was dated at Stirling on the 10th of March 1557, and subscribed by Glencairn, Erskine of Dun, Lorn, and James Stuart.[2] It was brought to Geneva by James Syme and James Barron, both burgesses of Edinburgh, and Knox having first laid the matter before his congregation and sought the advice of Calvin, resolved to comply with the invitation, and return home. In the beginning of October he proceeded to Dieppe, but while he waited there for a vessel to convey him to Scotland, he received other letters which dashed all his hopes, by counselling him to remain where he was.[3] The Reformers had suddenly changed their minds; they had come to the conclusion that it was better to enjoy the toleration which they had, than to peril it by seeking more, and thus, through faint-heartedness, had abandoned the project of a thorough reformation.

---

[1] Knox's History, book i. Keith, book i. chap. vi.

[2] Knox's History, book i.

[3] Ibid.

Sitting down in his lodging at Dieppe, Knox wrote a letter to the lords whose faith had failed, after inviting him to come to their help. He referred to the sacrifices he had already made—he had severed his connection with his flock at Geneva—he had seen the eyes of many grave men weep when he took his last good-night of them—he had left his poor family destitute of all head, save God only. He acknowledged his belief that troubles would arise, but it was their duty to meet danger in so glorious a cause. He spoke of their position as feudal barons, and of the claims which their vassals had upon them; and finally prayed that the mighty spirit of the Lord Jesus would rule and guide their counsels to His eternal glory.[1] This letter was dated the 27th October 1557. With it he despatched another addressed to the whole nobility of Scotland, and others to particular friends, as to the lairds of Dun and Pittarrow. In the meantime, he did not consider it prudent to venture into Scotland. It was a period of suspense—the fate of the Reformation depended on the issue.

The letters of Knox had an immediate and powerful effect in stimulating the decaying zeal of the Reforming nobles. Like a fire stirred up just when ready to die out among its own ashes, it now burned more brightly than ever. Meeting at Edinburgh in the month of December, they drew up a bond which knit them into one body, pledged them to a definite line of conduct, and gave consistency and shape to their plans. They had separated from the Roman communion; they now formed themselves into an opposing phalanx. This document is known in Scottish Church history as the first Covenant, and is so important that we give it entire.

"We, perceiving how Satan, in his members, the antichrists of our time, cruelly do rage, seeking to overthrow and destroy the gospel of Christ and His congregation, ought, according to our bounden duty, to strive in our Master's cause, even unto the death, being certain of the victory in Him. The which our duty being well considered, we do promise before the Majesty of God and His congregation, that we, by His grace, shall, with all diligence, continually apply our whole power, substance, and our very lives, to maintain, set forward, and establish the most blessed Word of God and His congregation; and shall labour, at our possibility, to have faithful ministers, truly and purely to minister Christ's gospel and

---

[1] Knox's History, book i.

sacraments to His people. We shall maintain them, nourish them, and defend them, the whole congregation of Christ, and every member thereof, at our whole powers and waging of our lives, against Satan and all wicked power that doth intend tyranny or trouble against the foresaid congregation. Unto the which holy word and congregation we do join us, and so do forsake and renounce the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof; and, moreover, shall declare ourselves manifestly enemies thereto, by this our faithful promise before God, testified to His congregation by our subscription to these presents, at Edinburgh, the 3rd day of December 1557 years. God called to witness—A., Earl of Argyle, Glencairn, Morton, Archibald, Lord of Lorn, John Erskine of Dun," &c.

From the time that the Reformers had resolved to refrain from being present at mass, they had been in the habit of meeting among themselves for the purpose of worship. They generally assembled in private houses, and one of the number was chosen to read the Scriptures, to exhort them, and give utterance to their prayers. Roman controversialists[1] affirm that some lords and gentlemen administered the sacrament of the Supper to their own household servants and tenants; and the "First Book of Discipline" gives countenance to the idea that such irregularities had occurred.[2] Elders and deacons were chosen to superintend the affairs of these infant communities. Edinburgh has the honour of having given the example, and the names of her first five elders are still preserved.[3] The existence of these small Protestant *congregations*, scattered over the country, probably led the lords to employ the word so frequently in their bond, and this again led to their being called the Lords of the Congregation. It was a bold document to which they had thus put their names. It

---

[1] Ninian Wingate. His writings have been published by the Maitland Club.

[2] "Where not long agoe men stood in such admiration of that idol the masse, that none durst have presumed to have said the masse but the shaven sort, the beast's marked men; some dare now be so bold, as without all vocation to minister, as they suppose, the true sacrament in open assemblies; and some idiots (yet more wickedly and impudently) dare counterfeit in their house that which the true ministers do in open congregation, they presume, we say, to do it in houses without reverence, without word preached, and without minister." (First Book of Discipline, chap. xvi. sect. i.)

[3] M'Crie's Life of Knox. Period Fifth.

was throwing down the gauntlet to all the powers of the existing Church and State. It was a solemn repetition of their putting on their steel bonnets in the presence of the queen. It is easy to see the spirit of feudalism underlying the spirit of the Reformation.

General declarations are often intended merely for parade, and having served their purpose they are allowed to lie idle, but it was not so here. Immediately after the subscription of the Covenant, the lords who signed it, and those who concurred with them, passed the following resolutions:—

I. It is thought expedient, advised, and ordained, that in all parishes of this realm the Common Prayer be read weekly on Sunday and other festival days, publicly in the parish churches, with the lessons of the Old and New Testaments, conform to the order of the Book of Common Prayer. And if the curates of the parishes be qualified, that they read the same; and if they be not, or if they refuse, that the most qualified in the parish use and read the same.

II. It is thought necessary that doctrine, preaching, and interpretation of Scriptures be had and used privately in quiet houses, without great conventions of the people thereto till God move the prince to grant public preaching by faithful and true ministers.[1]

Resolutions like these were enough to make the clergy flock to the regent with complaints; for here was a small knot of barons quietly setting aside the "Three Estates," usurping their power, and making ordinances affecting the whole realm. What title had they to order what was to be done in all the parishes of Scotland? Who invested them with a commission to compel the curate to lay aside his missal, and adopt the Common Prayer-Book in its stead? A body of dissenters so acting in our day would either be laughed at for their insolence, or punished for their treason. We cannot justify these Lords of the Congregation by any law or by any precedent; and yet we must thank them for doing as they did, for we owe to them our religion and our liberties. Perhaps it was a presumptuous sin in them assuming to legislate for both Church and State, but their legislation was such as to save both. But whatever we may think of the first resolution, the second undoubtedly breathes a spirit of moderation. It shows that the Reforming nobles wished to avoid a collison with the State; and perhaps we ought to interpret the first by the light of the

---

[1] Knox's History, book i. Keith, book i. chap. vi.

second, and regard it as referring to what they were determined to bring about by constitutional means, rather than to what they designed to do by their own authority. At all events, they could carry it out only in those districts where they had feudal jurisdiction. Their mode of procedure is referred to in a letter from Cecil to Throkmorton, of 9th July 1559, from which we also learn that the Prayer-Book referred to was that of Edward VI. "The Protestants," says he, "are at Edinburgh. They offer no violence, but dissolve Religious Houses, directing the lands thereof to the Crown, and to ministry in the Church. The parish churches they deliver of altars and images, and have received the service of the Church of England according to King Edward's book."[1]

The Archbishop of St Andrews, about this period, made an effort to detach the Earl of Argyll from the Congregation. He sent to him Sir David Hamilton with a friendly letter, and an elaborate memorandum, pointing out the disgrace which heresy would bring upon his ancient and honourable house; counselling him to dismiss the Protestant preacher he entertained as his chaplain; and offering to provide him with a confessor of orthodox faith. Argyll was not to be moved. He answered the archbishop's memorandum minutely, but in a moderate spirit, adhering to the opinions and cause he had espoused. It was not long after this that he died; but his son, a still more decided Reformer, succeeded to his influence in the Western Highlands.[2]

Unfortunately the Archbishop of St Andrews now resorted to sterner measures to stay the progress of the Reformation, and he put forth his hand, not upon a powerful baron, but upon a helpless priest, venerable for his piety and his years. Walter Mill had been the parish priest of Lunan, but during the primacy of Cardinal Beaton he had incurred the suspicion of heresy, and sought safety in concealment. Deceived by the clemency of the queen-regent, he had now ventured from his hiding-place, and was apprehended at Dysart. When brought before the ecclesiastical tribunal at St Andrews, the old man appeared hardly able to stand, much less to

---

[1] Forbes's State Papers, i. 155, quoted in the Notes to Dr M'Crie's Life of Knox. There is afterwards quoted a letter of the same period from Kirkcaldy of Grange to Sir Henry Percy, which decides the controversy which was waged by Sage and Anderson regarding the book used, still more definitively. The fact is now beyond all controversy.

[2] Knox's History, book i.

defend himself; but when charge after charge was brought against him, he answered with such firmness as to show that an undaunted spirit could rise superior to all bodily infirmity. He was convicted of heresy; but such was the commiseration for his fate, that no temporal judge could be got to pronounce upon him sentence of death, till a dissolute retainer of the archbishop performed the odious office. When led to the stake, his gray hairs and tottering steps excited universal sympathy. "As for myself," said the patriarchal martyr from amidst the flames, "I am fourscore and two years old, and cannot live long by the course of nature; but a hundred better shall rise out of the ashes of my bones, and I trust in God that I am the last that shall suffer death in Scotland for this cause."[1] His prayer was heard; he was the last.

The names of twenty individuals[2] are recorded as having lost their lives in the long conflict between Popery and Protestantism in our country; a small number when we consider that it was a life and death struggle between an ancient system deeply rooted in many hearts, and a new-born hostile faith, flushed with youthful vigour, and bent not merely on toleration but conquest. A much greater number might fall in an out-post skirmish or a midnight sortie, which would be deemed too insignificant to be mentioned in history. But while history may fail to mourn every hero who falls in battle, she will ever feel it her most sacred duty to pause and shed a tear on the martyr's grave. Men will never regard with equal veneration death defiantly met on the battle-field, and death calmly endured at the stake.

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii. Lindsay of Pitscottie, History. Keith, book i. chap. vi. Spottiswood's History, lib. ii.

[2] This is the sum of the names given by Fox the martyrologist, and others. M'Crie, in his Notes, tries to make it appear that many more were put to death for their religion; that between 1534 and 1539 about sixty persons suffered death, banishment, or confiscation of goods, and many more not included in that period. He refers to the Treasurer's Accounts, and Register of Privy Seal, and other ancient records. We think it highly probable that many suffered fines, the confiscation of goods, and exile; but we must still doubt if more, at least many more, than those we have mentioned suffered death. It is wrong to say that history has recorded the sufferings of the rich and distinguished only—several of those whose names have been preserved belonged to the poorer orders; and piety in all ages has exhibited a peculiar solicitude to treasure up the tears and blood of the martyrs, so that we cannot believe many names have been lost.

The hundreds of thousands who perished in the European wars which followed the Reformation are forgotten; the memory of the martyrs is fondly cherished; and it is right they should be held in everlasting remembrance. It is the silent protest of all generations against the horrid iniquity of putting a man to death, under the shadow of justice, simply for the opinions he may have held. And yet that a man should be punished, even to burning, for error in intellectual belief, is an opinion which still lingers in the world. It were folly to say that the smallness of the number of our martyrs is honourable to a Church which has stereotyped persecution in its creed; but it is honourable to the moderation of the men who, at that period of the conflict, held in their hands the government of the country; it is honourable to the humane genius of the Scottish nation.

The death of Mill was followed by a strong reaction in favour of Protestantism. The inhabitants of St Andrews placed a cairn of stones over his grave, and every district of the country was canvassed for adherents to the Congregation, which now began to feel its numerical strength.[1] While the blood of the people was up, it was resolved to present a remonstrance and petition to the regent. In this document the Protestant barons declared that such was the tyranny of the ecclesiastical Estate, that there remained for them "nothing but fagot, fire, and sword;" that they ought, as a part of the power of the realm, to have defended their brethren from cruel murder, and have given open testimony of their faith with them; that they now desired to do this, lest their silence should afterwards be liable to misconstruction; and they concluded by petitioning her Grace—I. That it might be lawful for them to meet in public or in private for common prayers in the vulgar tongue, to the end they might grow in knowledge, and be induced in sincerity of heart to commend unto God the holy universal Church, the queen their sovereign, her honourable and gracious husband, the succession to the throne, her grace the regent, the nobility, and the whole estate of the realm. II. That it should be lawful for any person of sufficient knowledge to interpret any hard places of Scripture that might be read in their meetings. III. That baptism and the Lord's Supper should be administered in the vernacular, and the latter in both kinds. And, lastly, That the wicked and scandalous lives

---

[1] Keith's History, book i. chap. vi.

of the clergy should be reformed, according to the rules contained in the New Testament, the writings of the ancient fathers, and the laws of Justinian, to which three they were willing to leave the decision of the controversy between them and the clergy.[1]

A.D. 1558. This petition was presented to the queen-regent by Sir James Sandilands, Preceptor of the Knights of St John, a man of venerable years and unblemished life, who had early attached himself to the principles of the Reformation. The queen received the petition with her usual benignity, and granted permission for the evangel to be preached and the sacraments administered in the vulgar tongue; only she requested that, in the meantime, they should not preach publicly in Edinburgh or Leith; and the Reformers, in turn, to show their gratitude and desire for peace, interdicted Douglas from preaching in the latter town, as he had intended to do.[2] Encouraged by the success of their application to the regent, the Lords of the Congregation resolved to bring the matter before a meeting of ecclesiastics, which was sitting in Edinburgh in the month of November 1558. After some violent altercation, they seemed willing to grant that the gospel might be preached and the sacraments administered in the vulgar tongue, provided the mass, purgatory, and prayers for the dead were retained.[3] It was well for Scotland that the Reformers did not accept of this compromise; and yet it was much for Romish ecclesiastics to offer. There must have been amongst them at the time a feeling of weakness, and a desire to patch up a compromise before all compromise became hopeless.

The period for the meeting of parliament was now rapidly approaching. It had been cited to meet at Edinburgh toward the end of November; and the Lords of the Congregation resolved to bring their grievances before it. Their petition concluded with the following specific requests:—I. That all acts of parliament empowering Churchmen to proceed against heretics should be suspended until a general council of the Church, lawfully convened, should decide the present controversies in religion; and that, in the meantime, Churchmen

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii. Keith, book i. chap. viii.

[2] Knox's History, book ii.

[3] Lesley, Keith, and others, speak of a Council being held at this date; but there is no record of it, and it was probably only an informal meeting of churchmen.

should only be allowed to act as accusers before a temporal judge, and not to sit as judges themselves. II. That, in all cases of this kind, an authentic copy of the accusation and depositions should be allowed to the accused, and every defence competent in law permitted to him. III. That every party accused should be allowed to interpret his own mind and meaning, and that such interpretation should be held superior to the deposition of any witness whatever. Lastly, That none of the Congregation should be condemned for heresy, unless he should be convicted by the Word of God to have erred from the faith which the Holy Scripture witnessed to be necessary to salvation.[1]

These demands were first submitted to the queen-regent, whose good offices the Reformers were anxious to secure. "She spared not amiable looks," says Knox, "and good words in abundance; but always she kept our petition close in her pocket."[2] The Reformers urged her to bring it before parliament; but she spoke of the unfitness of the time, the strength of the ecclesiastical Estate, and manœuvred so cleverly that the parliament was dissolved without the petition being so much as presented. The petitioners, however, publicly protested that it would be lawful for them to worship God according to their consciences, without incurring any danger of life and lands; that should any tumult arise on account of religious differences, the blame of it should not be imputed to them; and that their requests had no other end but the reformation of the abuses which had grown up in the Church.[3]

Up to this point, royal favour appeared to smile upon the Reformers. Mary of Guise almost seemed to have forgotten her family traditions and her country's faith, that she might foster the Reformation. The Protestants carried all their sorrows to the foot of the throne, certain that they would be received with benignant smiles, and dismissed with most gracious assurances. The regent had a purpose to serve, which made her court the Protestants; but when it was served, her countenance forthwith was changed. Her daughter was grown up to womanhood; the conditions of her marriage with the Dauphin must be arranged; and the friendly influence of the Protestant lords was required. In truth, such are the strange caprices of state policy, that this Guisian

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii. Keith, book i. chap. viii.

[2] History, book ii.

[3] Knox's History, book ii.

queen was compelled to look to the Protestants rather than to the Papists for support. The Duke of Chastelherault regarded her with jealousy ever since she had supplanted him in the regency; he regarded her with especial jealousy when dealing with matrimonial affairs, as she might supplant him in his hopes of succeeding to the throne; and the Duke of Chastelherault, through his brother, the archbishop, had a powerful sway over the whole ecclesiastical body. She artfully played the Lords of the Congregation against the adherents of Hamilton; and thus Protestantism, for a time at least, was on the royal and winning side of the game.

In a parliament held on the 14th of December 1557, nine commissioners had been appointed to proceed to Paris, and be present at the marriage of the queen—the Archbishop of Glasgow, the Bishops of Ross and Orkney, the Earls of Rothes and Cassillis, Lords Seton and Fleming, the Prior of St Andrews, and the Laird of Dun.[1] The instructions to the commissioners were framed in a wise and patriotic spirit, and the commissioners discharged their trust faithfully and well. The open conduct of the French court was fair and honourable; but, veiled from the light of day, there had been perpetrated a deed of base and deliberate villany. The Scottish queen—a confiding girl of fifteen—was induced to sign three separate documents, by which she made over in free gift her kingdom of Scotland to the French king in the event of her dying childless. But all this was unknown at the time, and on the 24th of April 1558 the marriage was solemnised with extraordinary pomp in the Church of Notre Dame. When the days of feasting were ended, and the commissioners were on their way home, no fewer than four of them sickened and died at Dieppe. The thing was mysterious; the Princes of Guise were regarded as skilful poison-seethers, and it was universally believed in Scotland that they had prescribed for the commissioners, although it was difficult to show what object they could have for their death. On the 29th of November 1558 a parliament was called to receive the surviving members of the fatal expedition, and in this convention of Estates the queen regent managed parties so well as to get them to consent to bestow upon the Dauphin of France the matrimonial crown of Scotland. What more could the house of Guise desire, and had not their own diplomacy brought all these things to pass?

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. vii.

But other events came crowding fast, and, with them, other plans began to develop themselves. On the 17th of November 1558, Mary of England died, and resuscitated Popery died with her a second death. Her sister Elizabeth succeeded her on the throne, and, with a woman's true instinct of policy, placed herself at the head of the Protestants of Europe. But Elizabeth had been declared illegitimate by the parliament, and, Elizabeth out of the way, Mary of Scotland was the next heir to the English throne. The house of Guise wished to take the tide that leads to fortune at the flood. They persuaded their niece to assume the title and arms of Queen of England and Ireland, and she did so. And now if Scotland could only be quieted; if the Congregation could be coaxed to give up their foolish fondness for preachers, or if they could be forced into compliance by the tramp of armed men, it seemed impossible that Elizabeth could resist the odds that might be brought against her. With papal France on the south, and papal Scotland on the north, and hundreds of thousands of Papists in its own heart, might not the world behold with wonder Popery once more restored to England, amid the blazing of bonfires in which martyrs burned, and a daughter of Guise reigning by the Thames and the Liffy, as well as by the Forth and the Seine. All this was thought possible, and therefore the queen-regent no longer smiled upon the Protestants, but frowned, and threatened, and kept her French soldiers in drill, that they might use the last argument if all others should fail.

On the 2d of March 1559, a provincial synod assembled at Edinburgh to consider the state of the Church. There was laid before it a document which had been presented to the queen-regent on the part of some of the nobility, who apparently wished the reformation of the Church rather than its destruction. It stated that the canons of previous councils had produced little or no fruit, and that the Spiritual Estate, which ought to be a mirror and lantern to the rest, "is deteriorate nor emends be ony sic persuasion as hes hedertells usit." It prayed therefore that the canons of former councils should be enforced against the clergy who were living scandalous lives; that there should be preaching of God's word in every parish Church on the Sundays and holidays; that none should be admitted to the ministry unless qualified, and able at least to read the Catechism distinctly and plainly; that the prayers should be in the vulgar tongue; that at the celebration of the sacraments, their nature

should be explained to the people in English; that mortuary dues and Easter offerings should be made optional, and consistorial processes shortened. The petitioners declared, at the same time, that no one should be allowed to speak irreverently of the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, that no one should be suffered to take it upon himself to administer it, and finally, that no manner of person should destroy Church, Chapel, or religious place, or their ornaments, or innovate on the lovable ceremonies of Holy Kirk. A truly moderate and sensible petition.

The Synod, with this document before them, and seeing that affairs were becoming serious, passed no fewer than thirty-four canons. They appointed a commission to enforce the canons against the immoralities of the clergy; all churchmen, moreover, must be decently dressed and shaved; the canonical hours must be said daily, and the mass at least every Sunday and feast-day; Monasteries were to be inspected, Churches repaired; bishops must preach at least four times a year in their dioceses, parish priests must preach oftener than four times a year if they were able to preach at all; if they were not able, they must go to the public schools (*in gymnasiis publicis*), and learn to do it, but if above fifty years of age they might provide a substitute; the nature of the sacraments was to be explained to the people; mortuary dues were not to be exacted from the very poor; and the sacraments, as administered by the reformers, were not to be recognised. There was silence about the prayers in the language of the people. But as the cry for instruction was every day becoming more clamorous, a short exposition of the mass was ordered to be published.[1] History condescends to relate that it was sold for two-pence, and therefore called in derision, "The Two-Penny Faith."[2]

Such were the canons of the last of the councils. They will remain to all time as a memorial of the state of the Scotch Church just before its reformation. Notwithstanding the decrees of previous Synods, in very many of the manses and episcopal palaces there were still unwedded wives and numerous families, and now these must be turned to the door, or, at least, smuggled away out of sight; so had the Synod ordained;

---

[1] Robertson's Concilia, vol. ii. pp. 151-75.

[2] Knox, book i., and Spottiswood, book iii. A Black Letter copy of this tract still exists. It is only four pages. It is republished in the Miscellany of the Ballantyne Club, vol. iii. p. 313.

and inquisitors were appointed to see the thing done, with power to fine and even deprive of the benefice. It was the publicity of the thing! Naked and not ashamed! What were the wretched shavelings to do? They must either break with Rome, or part with those who were dearest to them on earth. The enforced decrees of clerical celibacy had brought this to pass. Bishop Lesley, the Romish historian, affirms that many, especially among the younger clergy, preferred the former course and joined the Protestants, that they might keep their harlots under the name of wives [1]—an unworthy taunt, coming from such a quarter. But this was not all—the parish parsons must read the catechism and preach; or, if they could not do so, they must go to school and learn. Poor old priests, up to fifty years of age, sent to school to learn to read and perorate, and all to please those horrid Calvinists, who were turning the world upside down! They might shave a little cleaner, and put on their rochets, if that would save the church, but to go to school again! Yet the Synod had decreed it, and was now determined to enforce it—for were not inquisitors appointed? It was clear a crisis had come. The Synod was willing to go as far as it could, and if possible meet the Reformers half way, though it was obliged to evade the serious proposition as to the offices of the church being read in the vulgar tongue, as the Council of Trent had not yet decided the matter. But these half-measures came too late: the hurricane was already rising, which, in less than another year, was to strew the beach with the wreckage of the Roman Church.

It was feared that the regent, to strengthen the resolutions of the Synod, might call the Protestant preachers to account. In these circumstances, the Earl of Glencairn and Sir Hugh Campbell of Loudon sought an interview with her Grace, to plead that their preachers might be protected so long as they preached sound doctrine; but the regent declared that, maugre all they could do, their ministers should be banished, though they preached as soundly as St Paul. The barons took the liberty of reminding her of her promises. "The promises of princes," said the queen, "are no further to be urged than it suits their convenience to keep them." "Then," said the earl, "if you renounce your promises, we

---

[1] Non quidem ut conscientiæ suæ satisfacerent sed ut libidinem expleturi, scorta, uxorum titulo, impune deinceps foverent. Lesley De Rebus, &c., pp. 546-7.

must renounce our allegiance."[1] The boldness of the feudal baron startled the finessing woman, and, lowering her tone, she promised to think of what could best be done to remedy what was wrong.

Whatever meaning the regent attached to this general declaration, she was soon led to give a practical interpretation of it. The town of Perth having given unequivocal symptoms of its attachment to the Reformation, she sent for Lord Ruthven, its provost, and charged him to put down the spirit of change. "I have power," said Ruthven, "over the bodies of the citizens, but none over their consciences." The queen told him he was too malapert to give her such an answer, and dismissed him in anger.[2] As Easter was approaching, she despatched able men to Montrose, Dundee, and Perth, to persuade the populace to keep the festival with the usual solemnities; but their persuasions were powerless, and high mass was celebrated with few to join in it.[3] Failing in argument, she had recourse to violence, and summoned all the preachers in the kingdom to compear at Stirling on the 10th of May.[4] They resolved to obey, and the gentry resolved to accompany them, not armed, but still determined to protect men whom they deemed to be innocent. Angus and Mearns were especially forward in this demonstration, and when the gentlemen from these counties arrived at Perth, they sent Erskine of Dun on to Stirling before them, to explain the cause of their coming. The regent got alarmed—for she seems in every menacing emergency to have had a woman's fears—and persuaded Dun to write to his friends to disperse, and that the summons would be withdrawn. In consequence of this, the preachers and their friends resolved to remain at Perth, and proceed no farther south. The 10th of May came, no preachers appeared, and the queen, forgetting her promise, commanded them to be "put to the horn"—a Scottish law-phrase, signifying "they should be declared rebels by the sound of the horn"—and all men prohibited, under pain of high treason, from holding any communication with them. The Laird of Dun, disgusted at the royal perfidy, left Stirling, and posted back to his friends in Perth.[5]

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii. Keith, book i. chap. viii.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Knox's History, book ii.

[4] Lesley says that Knox, Willock, Douglas, and Methven, only were summoned. (De Rebus, &c., lib. x.) It is probable there were not many more professed preachers in the whole country.

[5] Knox's History, book ii. Spottiswood, lib. iii. Keith, &c.

At this critical moment John Knox appeared. In the November of the preceding year he had received letters earnestly urging him to return, and taking a second leave of his friends at Geneva he began his journey homewards. He begged permission to pass through England, but he had recently published his "First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regiment of Women;" and though all the world knew it was Mary he attacked, Elizabeth felt that the argument applied to herself, and she could never forgive the writer of that tract. She refused him a passport.[1] Forced to proceed by sea, he landed at Leith, and after spending two days in Edinburgh, he hurried first to Dundee and then to Perth, where the Protestantism of the country was concentred, and arrived just when men's minds were in the greatest ferment, on account of their preachers being put to the horn. Proceeding to the church, he thundered against idolatry. The excitement of the period gave additional vehemence to his oratory, and he seemed like another Demosthenes, "wielding at will" the mighty multitude who had assembled to hear him. The sermon being done, the crowd dispersed, and only a few loiterers remained in the church, when a priest with inconceivable imprudence uncovered a rich altar-piece, decorated with images, and proceeded to celebrate mass. A lad standing by told him this was not to be borne, and the priest in anger struck him. The lad seized a stone, and threw it, but it missed the priest and smashed to pieces one of the images. It was the signal for the demolition of many a gorgeous altar and stately monastery. The on-lookers took part with the boy, a religious fury took hold of the people who came flocking back to the building, and in a few minutes every chapel was ransacked, every virgin, apostle, and saint broken to pieces, and the whole costly furniture of the church scattered in fragments on the floor. In a twinkling the whole city heard of what had been done; and a mob, still under the excitement of the sermon, began to assemble. The cry was given—"To the monasteries!" and in a short time the monasteries of the Black and Grey Friars were in ruins. The cry was next raised—"To the Charter House!" and soon of that magnificent structure there were left only the bare walls."[2]

When the regent heard of these outrages she was violently

---

[1] Knox's Letter to Cecil, Dieppe, 10th April 1559.

[2] Lesley, lib. x. Knox, book ii.

incensed, and is said to have vowed that she would raze the sacrilegious city to the ground, and sow its foundations with salt in sign of perpetual desolation.[1] In a few days she was in its neighbourhood with a considerable military following. The citizens shut the gates, and directed letters to the queen-regent, the nobility, and "to the generation of Antichrist, the pestilent prelates, and their shavelings within Scotland."[2] These letters proved that they were perfectly ripe for rebellion. The regent at first was unwilling to treat; but Glencairn, with upwards of two thousand followers, had made his way by forced marches and mountain roads to Perth, and threw a preponderating weight into the Protestant scale. It was finally agreed that both armies should be disbanded, and the town left open to the queen; that none of the inhabitants should be molested on account of their religion; that no French soldiers should enter the town; and that all other controversies should be referred to the next parliament.[3] In consequence of this treaty, the Congregation left Perth the day after it was concluded, but not till they had entered into a second bond or "Covenant" for mutual support and defence, which was subscribed by the Earls of Argyll and Glencairn, Lords Boyd and Ochiltree, the Prior of St Andrews, generally called the Lord James, and Campbell of Taringhame.[4]

The queen had no sooner got possession of Perth than she violated the treaty she had subscribed. She removed the Protestant magistrates from their offices, and substituted Papists in their room: she took steps toward the restoration of the Roman worship, and introduced a garrison, not indeed of French soldiers, but of Scotchmen in the pay of France, and who were therefore quite as odious to the citizens. The Earl of Argyll and the Lord James, anxious to suppress rebellion, had hitherto remained with the regent, but now they were so shocked at her want of faith that they withdrew, and repaired to St Andrews, where a great muster of the Congregation was about to be held. Other influential nobles followed their example.

Meanwhile Knox was not idle. Passing into Fife, he preached first at Crail and afterwards at Anstruther, and in both places his preaching was followed by the overturning of

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii.

[2] These letters are given at length in Knox's History.

[3] Knox's History, book ii. Keith, book i. chap. viii.

[4] Both Knox and Keith give this document in full.

altars and the breaking of images. Cupar had already followed the example set by Perth; and the poor priest was so distressed that he committed suicide. It was on Friday and Saturday that Knox preached in Crail and Anstruther, and he had arranged to preach at St Andrews on the Sunday. The archbishop, hearing this, got alarmed for his noble cathedral church, and came to St Andrews on Saturday night, accompanied with a hundred spears. A message was sent to Knox, that if he should attempt preaching on the morrow a dozen hackbuts would be levelled at his head, or, as it was phrased, "would light upon his nose." In these circumstances, he was strongly advised to abandon his design. But the fearless Reformer had long looked forward to preaching once more in the place where he had first been called to the ministry of the Word; the hope of it had solaced him while toiling in the galleys; he had foretold it when the tower of St Regulus had gleamed on his view far over the wave; and now, when his fondest wishes were about to be realised, he would not draw back for fear of man. The archbishop finding that Knox was determined, and that the inhabitants of the town were friendly to him, left on the Sunday morning, and repaired to Falkland, where the queen was. Knox preached in the cathedral church, and ancient memories gave an impassioned tone to his eloquence. Christ driving out the traffickers from the temple was the subject of his discourse, and the magistrates as well as the mob, understanding his arguments and heated by his fire, proceeded immediately after sermon to destroy the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries, and to rifle and deface all the churches in the town.[1]

The queen, full of grief and indignation, determined to march at once against the rioters. The armed members of the Congregation were not numerous, and they might have been taken by surprise; but the moment danger was anticipated, partizans flocked in from every quarter; "men," according to Knox, "seemed to rain from the clouds;" and encamping on Cupar Moor, midway between Falkland and St Andrews, they bid defiance to the queen's army. As both parties were unwilling to come to blows, a truce was agreed upon, and the queen promised in the course of a few days to send commissioners to St Andrews to arrange an armistice. But day after day passed; no commissioners came; and it began to be suspected, as indeed it was manifest, that the

---

[1] Knox, book ii.

queen only wished to gain time. The Congregation could not afford to be idle, as their array was liable to melt away, and therefore, facing northwards, they marched upon Perth, the garrison of which they compelled to surrender.[1]

About three miles west from Perth, upon ground gently sloping down to the Tay, stood the Abbey of Scone. It was venerable in the eyes of every Scotchman, as the place where the kings of Scotland had from time immemorial been crowned; and though robbed by Edward of its famous black stone, fabled to be the one upon which Jacob had pillowed his head at Bethel, enough remained to throw a peculiar interest around it. The Bishop of Moray was at this time Commendator of Scone, and resided there. He was a man of licentious manners, and had rendered himself obnoxious to the men of Perth and Dundee; but now, when his abbey was threatened, he became obsequious even to meanness, promised to send his followers to join those of the Congregation, and to vote on their side in the approaching parliament. All would not do: the "rascal multitude" poured from the city toward the abbey; and though Knox and other leading men of the Congregation hurried after them, and attempted to stay their fury, they succeeded only for a day. On the second day the torch was applied, and soon the beautiful house in which our fathers had worshipped and our monarchs had been crowned was burned up with fire.[2]

Only a day after this, the mob at Stirling, incited by the presence of the Earl of Argyll and Lord James Stewart, attacked and destroyed the monasteries in the town; and then proceeding to the Abbey of Cambuskenneth, which lifted up its lofty walls amid the windings of the Forth, and was everywhere visible from the rich corn-fields of the carse, they left it nearly as we now find it—an utter desolation. Flushed with these victories over the monuments of idolatry and architecture, the Congregation resolved to march upon Edinburgh. On their way they purged Linlithgow of its idols; and reaching the capital, from which the regent retreated on their approach, they finished what the mob had left undone in plundering Holyrood, destroying the convents, and clearing the churches of their altars and images.[3] The example was infectious, and spread fast and far. The Abbeys of Paisley,

---

[1] Knox, book ii. Lesley. Keith.

[2] Knox's History, book ii.

[3] Keith, book i. chap. viii. Knox, book ii. Lesley, lib. x.

Kilwinning, and Dunfermline were attacked, and all their "popish stuff" burned.[1]

Tradition has ascribed to Knox the party-cry, "Down with the crows' nests, or the crows will build in them again."[2] Whether true or not, it is like the man, and like his manner of going to work. Indicating great insensibility to the æsthetical, it shows a far-reaching policy. The wise captain, when he ferretted out the robber, destroyed his fortalice, that he might never harbour in it again. On the same principle, the Reformer, when he had ousted the monks, destroyed their monasteries. We would we had restored some of our ruined castles, to crown our crags, if we could have them without bandits; and we would we had still every one of our abbeys, if we had them without Benedictines or Augustinians, Franciscans, Carmelites, or Dominicans. But if the refuge and the rogue must go together, we would rather want robbers and picturesque castles, monks, and Gothic monasteries. Was it possible to destroy the one and preserve the other? Perhaps it was; but the usual tactics of war is to destroy everything which shelters the enemy; and the Reformation was a death-war against monachism. Who would put possibilities against the maxims of a universal policy? But might not every monument of superstition have been destroyed, and the bare buildings themselves been preserved to lodge a purer religion? Perhaps they might; but could the rabble which followed in the trail of the Congregation be expected to do just what was needful, and nothing more? As well try to keep a fierce soldiery in check when sacking a city. Every revolution must have its excesses. It is, indeed, impossible to read without a pang of the demolition of the Charter-House at Perth, and the burning of the Abbey at Scone; but our grief will subside when we reflect that a more glorious temple, built of living stones, has risen upon their ruins. But withal let no man indulge in imaginary sorrows, or dream that every ruined cathedral, abbey, and church which he sees, was reduced

---

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 468. See also Letters of Bishop Jewel to Peter Martyr—"All the monasteries are everywhere levelled with the ground, the theatrical dresses, the sacrilegious chalices, the idols and the altars are consigned to the flames, not a vestige of the ancient superstition and idolatry left." London, August 1st, 1559. Zurich Letters. Parker Society.

[2] Row's History of the Kirk of Scotland, p. 12. Spottiswood's History, lib. ii.

to its present desolation by the Reformers. War, time, neglect, and the barbarity of making grand old buildings quarries out of which to erect mean modern ones, have done far more than John Knox toward reducing our religious houses to the state of ruin in which we now find too many of them. And England must bear more than half the shame, for the border abbeys, the noblest of all, were destroyed by the English army under Hertford.

After the retreat of the queen-regent, and the occupation of the capital by the Congregation, both parties gave vent to mutual recriminations and reproaches. The regent issued proclamations, and the Congregation answered them. The regent accused the Congregation of rebellion and treason; the Congregation declared they wished nothing more than the reformation of religion and the expulsion of the French.[1] On the one side, it was industriously whispered that the Prior of St Andrews, notwithstanding his bastard blood, aspired to the throne; on the other, it was rumoured that the French had already parcelled out the country amongst them, and that one already rejoiced in the title of Monsieur d'Argyll, another of Monsieur de Prior, a third of Monsieur de Ruthven.[2] The known ambition and abilities of the young Lord James gave a colour of probability to what was said of him, and some even of the Congregation believed it. Jealousies arose; uncomfortable feelings about the end of traitors were experienced, though not confessed; barons began to slip away home; and the military muster to dissolve like frost-work in the sun. The regent, knowing this state of matters, marched upon Edinburgh, and the Congregation were glad to accept of the following terms of accommodation: "That, on the one side, the Congregation evacuate the capital, deliver up the dies of the mint, which they had seized, submit themselves to the authority of the king, queen, and regent, refrain from molesting ecclesiastics or hindering them in the lifting of their rents, and finally, cease from casting down religious houses, or stripping them of their furniture; and on the other side, that the citizens of Edinburgh should be allowed to choose their own religion, without being overawed by a garrison, and that the Protestant preachers should everywhere have full liberty of

---

[1] Proclamation by Regent, and Answer by the Congregation, July 1559, published at length by Keith, book i. chap. ix.

[2] Knox's History, book ii.

speech." These terms were subscribed on the 24th of July, and were to hold good till the 10th of January following.[1]

Driven from Edinburgh, the Protestants sought refuge in Stirling, where a third bond or "Covenant" was subscribed, in which the barons pledged themselves not to treat separately with the regent.[2] It was meant as a counter-check to the queen, who had been tampering with individuals, and attempting to detach them from the cause.

In the meantime, Henry II. died, slain in joisting with Count Montgomery, and Francis and Mary were now King and Queen of France. They were scarcely seated on the throne when they each wrote to the Prior of St Andrews, reminding him of the favours he had received at their hands, upbraiding him with ingratitude, want of natural affection, and treason, but leaving him place for repentance. The prior replied that he had done nothing against God or their Majesties, and that all he desired was a reformation of the Church.[3] But it could scarcely be hoped that threatening epistles could turn the tide of revolution. A large detachment of French auxiliaries arrived at Leith. Following in their train came a more peaceful band—the Bishop of Amiens as legate from the Pope, and three doctors of the Sorbonne. The soldiers began to fortify Leith, the bishop to purify the Church of St Giles from heretical pollutions, and the doctors to confute the heretics.[4] But notwithstanding the lustrations of the legate, and the reasonings of the Sorbonnists, the citizens refused to give up their High Church; and John Willock stoutly preached there.

Meanwhile the country was traversed by preachers, uttering fierce invectives against the regent and the Pope.[5] The regent complained of the language they used. "They merely proclaim and cry," said Knox, "that the same God who plagued Pharaoh, repulsed Sennacherib, struck Herod with worms, and made the bellies of dogs the grave and sepulchre of the spiteful Jezebel, will not spare misled princes, who authorise the murderers of Christ's members in this our time." "On this manner," said he, "they speak of princes in general, and of

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. ix. Lesley, lib. x.

[2] It will be found at length in both Keith and Knox.

[3] Lesley, De Rebus, &c., lib. x., where a copy of the letters of Francis and Mary is given, and an outline of the prior's reply. Keith's History, book i. chap. ix.

[4] Lesley, De Rebus, &c.

[5] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 433.

your Majesty in particular." But why should preachers meddle with State policy at all? said the regent. Again Knox had his answer: "Elias did personally reprove Ahab and Jezebel of idolatry, of avarice, of murder: Esaias the prophet called the magistrates of Jerusalem, in his time, companions to thieves, princes of Sodom, bribe-takers, and murderers; he complained that their silver was turned into dross, that their wine was mingled with water, and that justice was bought and sold: Jeremiah said that the bones of King Jehoiakim should wither with the sun: Christ Jesus called Herod a fox: and Paul calleth a high-priest a painted wall, and prayeth unto God that he should smite him, because that against justice he had commanded him to be smitten."[1] This was plain and not very pleasant language to be used by a preacher to a lady and a queen.

But the Lords of the Congregation now began to feel the need of exterior aid, and that, if England did not help them, their enterprise must fail. At the same time Elizabeth began to see that if she did not act energetically, Scotland might be filled with Frenchmen, who would march into England and topple her from her throne.

Towards the end of June and beginning of July, communications affecting matters in Scotland had passed between Kirkaldy of Grange, Sir Henry Percy, and Sir William Cecil, Queen Elizabeth's clear-seeing secretary. On the 19th of July, the Lords of the Congregation wrote to Cecil, referring to these, explaining their views, and soliciting his assistance.[2] As Knox was indispensable to the negotiations with the English government, he thought it right to make an effort to propitiate Elizabeth, whom he had grievously offended by his "Blast against the Monstrous Regiment of Women." On the 20th of July, he wrote Secretary Cecil, enclosing a letter for the queen, in which he deprecated her resentment, expressed his attachment to her person and government, but still honestly confessed his adherence to the general principles contained in his book, and warned her not to brag of her birth, or build her authority on changing laws, but on the eternal providence of Him who, contrary to nature and above her desserts, had exalted her head. Cecil answered his letters on the 28th, oddly beginning his note with the text, "There is neither male nor female, but we are all one in Christ," and then

---

[1] Knox's History, book ii.

[2] This letter will be found in Knox's History, book iii.

passing on to other matters.[1] The truth is, Knox had committed an unpardonable sin, and Elizabeth could never bear him. Cecil, in one of his letters to Sadler and Crofts, some months afterwards, declares, "of all others, Knox's name, if it be not Goodman's, is most odious here; and therefore I wish no mention of him hither."[2] On the same day on which Cecil wrote to Knox, he wrote to the Lords of the Congregation, hinting that, as they must be in want of money, they should appropriate the revenues of the Church, "putting good things to good uses."[3]

Though Knox was no favourite at the English court, he could not well be wanted as a negotiator; and on the 3d of August we find him at Berwick, closeted with Sir James Crofts, the governor, suggesting that Stirling Castle should be seized and strongly garrisoned; that Broughty Castle should, in like manner, be occupied; that, in order to do this, money to pay the troops must be furnished by England, ships of war must be ready to give assistance in case of need, and pensions allowed to some of the reforming barons who were hard up for cash.[4] About the middle of August Sir Ralph Sadler, than whom there was no one more intimately acquainted with Scotch affairs, arrived at Berwick to watch the movements of the Congregation, and treat with their emissaries. From this time, everything that happened in Scotland was made known to Sadler, and by Sadler communicated to Cecil. Randolph had come into Scotland to spy the land, and he writes; Balnaves writes; and Knox writes. Knox assumed the name of Sinclair—his mother's name—in his correspondence; and in a letter of date the 21st of September, he again tells Sadler that, unless some support were given to certain of the lords, they must, through extreme poverty, remain at home, and take

---

[1] Copies of these three letters are given in Knox's History, book iii. Tytler, however, has shown that the dates there given are wrong, and that those here given are the correct ones.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 532. Goodman was an Englishman, who fled the country during the reign of Queen Mary, and, when at Geneva, published a book entitled, "How Superior Powers ought to be obeyed of their Subjects, and wherein they may lawfully be disobeyed and rejected," &c. In this book he rails, like Knox, against the government of women; therefore Elizabeth's hate.

[3] MS. in State-Paper Office.

[4] MS. in State-Paper Office. In the Calendars of State Papers there is a summary of many documents throwing interesting light upon these transactions.

no part in the warlike movements that were contemplated."[1] The individuals referred to, as Sadler informs Cecil, were Glencairn, Dun, Grange, and Ormiston.[2] It was money, in fact, that the Lords of the Congregation chiefly wanted—money to pay their mercenaries, and money to support their own state as feudal barons with a feudal following. Elizabeth was parsimonious, and did not like to part with her money; but, overcome by the urgency of the case, she repeatedly sent considerable sums to the Reformers, under the pledge that the strictest secrecy would be observed as to the source from which they had come.[3]

But the most interesting inquiry remains—What were the objects which the Congregation had in view, and what was the policy of the English government in assisting them? These we are able minutely to trace. On the very day after the Congregation entered Edinburgh, Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange wrote to Sir Henry Percy—"I received your letter this last of June, perceiving thereby the doubt and suspicion you stand in for the coming forward of the Congregation, whom, I assure you, you need not have in suspicion, for they mean nothing but reformation of religion, which shortly, throughout the realm, they will bring to pass; for the Queen and Monsieur D'Osell, with all the Frenchmen, for refuge, are retired to Dunbar. The foresaid Congregation came this last of June, by three of the clock, to Edinburgh, where they will take order for the maintenance of the true religion, and resisting of the King of France if he sends any force against them. . . . . The manner of their proceeding in reformation is this,—they pull down all manner of friaries and some abbeys, which willingly receive not the Reformation. As to parish churches, they cleanse them of images and all other monuments of idolatry, and command that no masses be said in them; in place thereof the book set forth by godly King Edward is read in the same churches. They have never as yet meddled with a pennyworth of that which pertains to the Church, but presently they will take order throughout all the parts where they dwell, that all the fruits of the abbeys and other churches shall be kept and bestowed upon the faithful ministers, until such time as a farther order be taken.

July 1, 1559.

---

[1] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 455.

[2] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i. p. 469. Sadler, in mentioning Glencairn, somewhat piteously says, "he is indeed a puir man."

[3] Sadler's State Papers, vol. i., passim.

Some suppose the queen, seeing no other remedy, will follow their desires, which is a general reformation throughout the whole realm, conform to the pure Word of God, and the Frenchmen to be sent away. If her Grace will do so, they will obey her and serve her, and annex the whole revenues of the abbeys to the crown; if her Grace will not be content with this, they are determined to hear of no argument."[1]

Such were the views of the leaders of the Congregation on the 1st of July. By the 19th of the same month they have advanced a step farther. In a letter to Cecil, and in answer to the question, "What the Protestants within this realm do mean?" They say, "True it is, that as yet we have made no mention of any change in authority, neither yet were we minded to do any such thing, till extreme necessity compelleth us thereto; but seeing it is now more than evident that France, and the queen-regent here, with her priests, pretend nothing but the suppressing of Christ's gospel, the ruin of us, and the subversion of this poor realm, committing our innocency to God, and unto the judgment of all godly and wise men, we are determined to seek the remedy, in which we heartily require your counsel and assistance."[2] By the 19th of August this plan is assuming a definite shape, for on that day Argyll and the Lord James, in name of their brethren, write to the English secretary—"We cease not to provoke all men to favour our cause, and of our nobility we have established a council; but suddenly to discharge this authority [evidently the regent's], till that ye and we be fully accorded, it is not thought expedient."[3] By the 8th of September the scheme was ripe. "Whatever pretence they make," writes Sadler to Cecil, "the principal mark they shoot at is, as Balnaves saith, to make an alteration of the state and authority, to the extent that the same being established as they desire, they may then enter into open treaty with her Majesty, as the case may require. This, he saith, is very secret; and if the Duke will take it upon him, they mean to bestow it there; or, if he refuse, his son is as meet, or more meet for the purpose."[4]

The Lords of the Congregation had now hit upon the plan of all most agreeable to Elizabeth. Her policy was not to

---

[1] MS. Letter, State-Paper Office.

[2] Knox's History, book iii. Knox dates the letter on the 27th; we have already referred to this as a mistake.

[3] MS., State-Paper Office.

[4] Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i. p. 433.

reform religion, especially according to Knox's views, but to lessen French influence in Scotland; and there was no more effectual way of doing this than by depriving Mary of Guise of her regency. During the month of August, Cecil's and Sadler's letters are full of mysterious references to the arrival of the Earl of Arran. This young nobleman had held the command of the Scots Guard at Paris, but becoming suspected of heresy, he had fled to Geneva, and now he was passing through England on his way home. He entered Scotland in disguise under the name of Beaufort, accompanied by Randolph, who rejoiced in the name of Barnabie. This M. de Beaufort was the regent to be. It was even hoped he would soon be the husband of Elizabeth, and that thus the kingdoms would be united under a Protestant house, and the Catholic Mary cast overboard. His presence at Hamilton was soon seen in his influence over his vacillating father, whose conduct for some time had been dubious, though he was generally understood to lean to the regent; but now, turning Protestant once more, he threw in his lot with the Congregation. The plans thus secretly formed soon began to develop themselves.

In 1559 the harvest in Scotland was unusually late, and before it was well gathered in the Congregation was in motion.[1] On the 18th of October they entered Edinburgh, and the regent, upon their approach, left Holyrood, and retired within the fortifications at Leith. Rumours had got afloat that Chastelherault had joined the Protestants to cheat Lord James of the crown, and take it to himself. He purged himself with sound of trumpet at the market-cross.[2] On the 19th a message was sent to the regent, requiring her to send all Frenchmen furth the realm. The regent refused to accede to a demand, which, she said, was more like that of a prince to his subjects, than of subjects to a prince.[3] On the 21st the barons and their preachers assembled in the Tolbooth. No less weighty a matter than the deposition of the regent was debated. The preachers were required to give their opinion, and John Willock stood up. He argued that, albeit magistrates were the ordinance of God, they might upon good cause be removed, and that God had frequently raised up men to cut off wicked monarchs, "as by Asa he removed

---

[1] When urged to activity, they pleaded harvest operations as the cause of delay. (Sadler's State Papers, vol. i.)

[2] Keith's Hist., book i. chap. ix. Knox's Hist., book ii.

[3] Keith's Hist., book i. chap. ix.

Maacha, his own mother, from honour and authority; by Jehu he destroyed Joram, and the whole posterity of Ahab." Knox followed and concurred.[1] The plan had been determined upon a month ago; the preachers had been required to speak only that they might give to it the sanction of religion, and a deed was drawn depriving the regent of her office. The barons alleged that they took this decisive step in virtue of their being born-counsellors of the realm, but how many of the oligarchy had part in it we cannot discover, as, instead of appending their names individually to the deed of deprivation, they, strangely enough, made it to run in the name of—"Us, the nobility and commons of the Protestants of the Church of Scotland."[2]

The siege of Leith was now begun. An attempt was made to scale its walls and take it by storm, but utterly failed. On the 6th of November a convoy with provisions was seen approaching the city, and the garrison sallied out to cut it off. The Earl of Arran and the Lord James, with a band of followers, made for the rescue, and charged the French with such impetuosity that they got entangled in the marshy ground between Holyrood and Restalrig, and made a narrow escape of being surrounded and cut to pieces. A panic seized upon the city. Lord Erskine held the castle; his policy was doubtful, and men with pale faces whispered that he might bring the guns of the fortress to bear upon them. A flight was determined upon, and at midnight the members of the Congregation were crowding out of the city-gates and taking the road to Stirling. Then it was seen how many there are ready to change with the change of circumstances, and ever to keep on the winning side. Two days ago all Edinburgh seemed Protestant; "but now," says Knox, in dolour of heart, "the despiteful tongues of the wicked railed upon us, calling us traitors and heretics; every one provoked the other to cast stones at us."[3] The Congregation were hooted and pelted as they left the city.

Arrived at Stirling, the lords took counsel together as to what was to be done. It was plain that their raw musters could not cope with the disciplined soldiery of France, and that unless Elizabeth sent men and munitions of war, as well as money, to their aid, they must be crushed. Young Mait-

---

[1] Knox's Hist., book ii.

[2] The deed of deprivation is given by Knox at length. Hist., book ii.

[3] Knox's History, book ii.

land of Lethington had recently deserted the regent, and joined their cause. He was despatched to the English court. In the meantime, as the Reforming barons could easiest maintain themselves each in his own country, they resolved to divide — Chastelherault, Glencairn, Boyd, and Ochiltree, marched upon Glasgow; Arran, Rothes, the Lord James, and the Master of Lindsay, retired into Fife. Henry Balnaves was attached as secretary to the western division; John Knox to the eastern. At Glasgow, Chastelherault was not idle. He purged the churches of their idols, seized upon the archiepiscopal palace, and published proclamations in the name of the king and the queen; but a detachment of French from Edinburgh brought his procedure to an abrupt conclusion.

Elizabeth was most anxious to assist the insurgents, but was at a loss how to do it, as the kingdoms were at peace. In the month of October, Knox had proposed to Sir James Crofts that a thousand men or more should be sent into Scotland, and that so soon as they joined the Congregation they should be declared rebels, as if they had left England without the consent of the government. Crofts declared that such a proceeding would not blind the world, and would touch the honour of his prince.[1] Cecil was delighted with the rebuke which the diplomatist had administered to the preacher.[2] But as the emergency became greater, it was felt that something must be done, under whatever pretence. Cecil had already sent down to Scotland minute instructions as to the precise way in which all applications for assistance should be made. The only subject to be insisted upon was that the French, by conquering Scotland, would endanger England and Ireland. In the instructions given to Lethington for his conduct at the English court, this programme of procedure was faithfully observed, so that when Maitland spoke, Elizabeth could only hear the echo of her own voice.[3] The result of all this crooked diplomacy was, that a secret treaty was concluded at

---

[1] Keith gives both these letters in his Appendix. Knox signs himself John Sinclair.

[2] "Surely I like not Knox's audacity, which was well tamed in your answer. His writings do no good here, and therefore I do rather suppress them, and yet I mean not but that he should continue in sending them." (Cecil to Sadler and Crofts. Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i. p. 535.)

[3] Compare letter of Cecil to Sadler and Crofts of 12th November, with instructions given to Lethington, 25th November 1559. (Sadler's State Papers, &c., vol. i.)

Berwick between Elizabeth and the Lords of the Congregation, in which she undertook to assist them in expelling the French.

After the retreat of the Protestants from the capital, the French marched into Fife. Proceeding along the coast, they observed some large ships of war bearing up the Frith. At first they imagined them to be from France with auxiliary troops, and gave them a salute, but it soon became plain that they were English vessels, whatever might be the design of their coming. The admiral said he had been sent in quest of some pirates, and wished to skulk for a time in the Frith that he might unexpectedly pounce upon them; but nobody believed him, and the French instantly began their retreat. The English fleet was soon followed by an English army, and in the month of April 1560, Leith found itself besieged for the second time. Elizabeth and Cecil had frequently upbraided the Scots for their dilatoriness and want of success during the previous siege. They now found it was not so easy as they had supposed to enter a town lying to the sea, strongly fortified, and defended by veteran troops. Batteries were opened, skirmishes fought, an escalade attempted, but still Leith was not taken. But hope did not fail; the treaty of Berwick was renewed and confirmed; and the Lords of the Congregation put their names to a fourth Covenant, in which they pledged themselves to pursue their object to the last extremity, to be enemies to enemies, and friends to friends.[1]

Upon the approach of the English army the queen-regent retired within the Castle of Edinburgh, into which Lord Erskine willingly received her. Worn out with grief, swollen and breathless from dropsy, she knew she was dying. Feeling her end to be near, she expressed a wish to have an interview with some of the confederate lords, and accordingly the Duke of Chastelherault, the Earls of Argyll, Marischal, and Glencairn, and the Lord James Stuart, waited upon her in her sick room. She declared to them how she had loved Scotland—how she had lamented the troubles that had arisen—how earnestly she desired peace. She recommended them to send both the French and the English troops out of the country, but at the same time to preserve inviolate their ancient alliance with France, as her daughter, their queen, was now united in marriage with its monarch. She at last burst into tears, asked pardon of all whom she had in any way offended, and declared

---

[1] Knox's Hist., book iii. Keith, book i. chap. xi.

that from her heart she forgave those who had offended her. Composing herself a little, she kissed the nobles one by one, and held out her hand to be kissed by the attendants who happened to be in the room. The rough barons were deeply moved, and, sincere in their religious convictions, they proposed that John Willock should be sent for to prepare her for death. The Catholic queen agreed to receive the Protestant preacher, and Willock came. He spoke to her of the merits of Christ, and the abominations of the mass. She declared that her only hope was in Christ, but regarding the mass she was silent. The next day she died.[1]

We cannot help loving Mary of Lorraine, albeit she was a Papist and a Guise. No Frenchwoman, before or since, ever became so naturalised to Scotland as she, though she never understood the rough temper of its people. Brought from the most dissolute court in Europe, her court was an example to every household in the kingdom. Admired for her beauty and wit in the brilliant circle of Francis I., she had adapted herself to her altered circumstances, both as wife and widow, and made her husband's country her own. She herself was accustomed to visit the sick and the poor, and with womanly kindness relieve them. Justice was never more strictly administered than during her government. But she was fated to live in troublous times, and when her subjects changed their religion she could not change hers. A collision became inevitable between a government still Catholic, a church still Catholic, and a nobility turned Protestant. Instead of marvelling at this, it were wiser to marvel that the collision was not more violent than it was, and that so great a revolution was effected with so little loss of blood. It was not to be expected that she should be able to free herself of French influences, more especially considering that her daughter the Queen of Scotland was Dauphiness of France. The only thing for which we find it hard to forgive her was her frequent violations of solemn promises. The truth is, that when affairs were threatening the woman got alarmed, and made promises which she broke when the danger was past. A resolute man would not have made the promises, and would not have been taunted for breaking them. But her death-scene covers all. She begged our forgiveness—shall we refuse to give it? Knox did not forgive her; and we are ashamed to write that a vindictive intolerance followed her to the grave. "Question being

---

[1] Lesley. Knox. Spottiswood. Keith, &c., &c.

moved about her burial," says he,[1] "the preachers boldly gainstood that any superstitious rites should be used in that realm, which God of His mercy had begun to purge. Her burial was deferred till further advisement; and so she was laid in a coffin of lead, and kept in the castle from the 10th of June till the 19th of October, when she was carried by some pioneers to a ship." In this vessel she was carried over the troubled, restless sea to France, and buried in the Benedictine Monastery of St Peter's, at Rheims, of which her sister Renée was the abbess; and where she herself had desired that her ashes might repose.

Thus lived, died, and was buried, Mary of Lorraine, Dowager Duchess of Longueville, and Queen Regent of Scotland. It is known that Henry of England wanted her to wife, as he had heard much of her large and comely person; and refused to be satisfied even when he heard of her betrothal to his nephew in Scotland.[2] How would it have fared with her had she gone to England? Would she have shared the fate of the other wives, or would her personal charms and Guisean ways have turned the heart of the king and stayed the Reformation?

Before the death of the regent both France and England had become earnestly desirous of peace; and in the month of May commissioners had been appointed to adjust its terms. But there were grave difficulties in the way, as the negotiations must include, in some way or other, not only England and France, but the Lords of the Congregation, who had been in open rebellion against their natural sovereign. The firmness of Cecil got rid of the difficulty, and a treaty was agreed upon, in which was embraced all that France and England desired; while at the same time the safety of the Lords of the Congregation was guaranteed, and the Reformation of religion in Scotland, though not mentioned, virtually secured.[3] The chief articles of this important treaty, so far as it referred to Scotland, were:—That both the French and the English

---

[1] Knox's History, book iii. Randolph wrote to Killigrew that the corpse was treated with the greatest respect, and that it should receive all solemnities excepting such as savoured of superstition. June 20th, 1560. State Papers.

[2] Carte's Hist., vol. iii. p. 152. Tytler's Hist., chap. ix.

[3] As the queen had not given her commissioners any instructions to treat upon these two last points, she refused to ratify the treaty so far as it had reference to them. Nevertheless the treaty was acted upon, as if it were good in every respect.

troops should be withdrawn; that an act of oblivion should be passed for all offences committed between the 6th of March 1558 and the 1st of August 1560; that the barons and commonality of the realm should bear no quarrels against each other for anything done during that period; that those who had possessions or benefices in France should have them restored; that all ecclesiastics who had received injuries during the commotions should receive redress, and that they should not now be hindered in lifting their rents; that the government should, in the meantime, be conducted by a council of twelve, seven of whom should be chosen by the queen, and five by the Estates; and that in the month of August next a parliament should be held, for which a commission should be sent by the king and queen, and that this convention should be as lawful in all respects as if it had been ordained by the express command of their Majesties.

In this document the Reformation appears to be ignored, and the Papacy protected. This arose from the desire of Elizabeth to have it understood that she began the war, not from religious considerations, but simply from a determination to prevent the ascendancy of France in the island. The treaty of Leith must be read by the light of the treaty of Berwick. But the article which permitted the Scotch to hold a parliament, put it in their power to effect a reformation in the Church, if it were found that a majority of the representatives of the nation desired it. The change from Prelacy to Presbyterianism was afterwards effected in the same way, not by the mandate of a monarch, not by an article in a treaty, but by a vote in parliament; and of all possible modes it was the most legitimate. On the 8th of July the peace was proclaimed at the Market Cross of Edinburgh, and public thanks were given to God in the church of St Giles.

The thoughts and desires of the nation were now concentrated upon the approaching parliament. According to the specific terms of the treaty, it met on the 10th of July, and then adjourned to the 1st of August, to afford time for receiving a commission from the sovereigns. On the 1st of August the Parliament House was unusually full, and a scrutiny of the faces showed there were many there who had never sat in a parliament before.[1] In ancient times the whole landed proprietors who held their estates directly by charter from the

---

[1] Keith, book i. chap. xii., gives the parliamentary roll. The newcomers far outnumbered all the others.

crown, as well as the titled nobility, possessed the privilege of appearing in the legislature ; but the difficulty and expense of travelling to the capital had prevented their regular attendance, and for nearly a century their right had fallen into abeyance.[1] Now, upwards of a hundred of these appeared and claimed their seats, and after some ineffectual opposition, their claim was allowed. This secured an overwhelming majority in favour of reform.

The next question debated was, whether or not they might now proceed to business, seeing that no commission had as yet been received from the queen. Some held that the want of a commission was fatal to the parliament, others that the terms of the treaty supplied the defect, and after a discussion which lasted for a week, a vote was taken, and it was carried that they should continue their sittings.[2] Maitland of Lethington was chosen "harangue-maker," and next were chosen the Lords of the Articles, whose business it was to prepare the measures to be brought before the Estates. When the election was over the clergy declared that, of those taken from their body, several were mere laics and all were apostates.[3] But remonstrance was useless; the banks of the old mill-dam were bursting, and it was already evident in what direction the flood would flow, and what institutions would be swept away in its course.

These were but out-post skirmishes, and the great battle was yet to be fought. A petition was presented in name of "the barons, gentlemen, burgesses, and other true subjects of this realm, professing the Lord Jesus within the same," praying that idolatry should be abolished, the sacraments administered in their original purity, the discipline of the ancient Church restored, and the patrimony usurped by the Pope applied to the maintenance of a true ministry, the founding of schools, and the support of the poor. This document, which Knox has preserved,[4] unfortunately abounds in coarse and unbecoming language, for which we can scarcely find an apology in the rudeness of the times. After some debate, the barons and ministers who had presented the petition were called and "commandment given unto them to draw into plain and several heads, the sum of that doctrine which they would maintain, and would desire the present parliament to establish as whole-

---

[1] There is an excellent dissertation on this subject in Pinkerton's History, vol. ii.

[2] Keith's History, book i. chap. xii. Tytler's History, vol. vi.

[3] Spottiswood, lib. iii.

[4] History, book iii.

some, true, and only necessary to be believed, and to be received within the realm."[1] The task was undertaken, and in four days it was accomplished.

This Confession of Faith was contained in twenty-five articles, treating respectively—of God; Of the Creation of Man; Of Original Sin; Of the Revelation of the Promises; Of the Continuance, Increase, and Preservation of the Church; Of the Incarnation of Christ Jesus; Of why it behoveth the Mediator to be Very God and Very Man; Of Election; Of Christ's Death, Passion, and Burial; Of the Resurrection; Of the Ascension; Of Faith in the Holy Ghost; Of the Cause of Good Works; Of what Works are reputed good before God; Of the Perfection of the Law and the Imperfection of Man; Of the Church; Of the Immortality of the Soul; Of the Notes by which the True Church is Discerned from the False, and who shall be Judge of the Doctrine; Of the Authority of the Scriptures; Of General Councils, of their Power, Authority, and cause of their Convention; Of the Sacraments; Of the Right Administration of the Sacraments; Of those to whom Sacraments Appertain; Of the Civil Magistrate; Of the Gifts freely given to the Church. It is a clear and logical summary of Calvinistic doctrine, more concise and less definite than the Westminster Confession, but agreeing with it in every essential respect.

It was first submitted to the Lords of the Articles, and afterwards to the whole parliament, some of the ministers attending to give any explanations that might be required, or defend any of the doctrines that might be impugned.[2] In order that so grave a matter might not be done hurriedly, an adjournment took place to give time for reflection, and when the parliament again met, the Confession was again read over article by article. The vote was then taken which was to decide the faith of many succeeding generations in Scotland. Man by man was asked his opinion. Of the temporal peers present, the Earls of Athole, Caithness, and Cassillis, and the Lords Somerville and Borthwick, alone said "No" to the new creed, declaring they would believe as their fathers believed.[3]

---

[1] Knox's History, book iii.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Upon the authority of a letter from Randolph to Cecil, Tytler mentions only Cassillis and Caithness as dissenting. Knox says that Athole, Somerville, and Borthwick opposed the new creed. We may safely regard either list as imperfect, and conclude that the two combined give the nearest approximation to the truth. Neither Randolph nor Knox would place among their opponents nobles who were their friends.

Of the Spiritual Estate, of whom few were present, the Bishops of St Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane alone made an effort at resistance; the others, seeing that opposition would be useless, "spake nothing."[1] The great victory was won. The enthusiasm of the assembly was at the highest, and the venerable Lord Lindsay rose and declared that he could say with Simeon—"Now, Lord, let thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."[2]

It was on the 17th of August that the Parliament adopted the Confession of Knox as the confession of its faith. But something more required to be done to make the work of Reformation complete. On the 24th of the month the Estates again assembled, and passed three acts which finished the long reign of Romanism in the country. By the first it was statute and ordained that all previous acts of parliament regarding the censures of the Church, or the worshipping of saints, should be annulled and deleted from the statute-book. By the second, the Pope's jurisdiction was abolished within the realm. By the third, to say a mass or hear a mass was made criminal; the first offence to be punished with confiscation of goods; the second with banishment; the third with death.[3]

The intolerance which the Romish Church had meted out to others was now meted out to herself; so had an eternal Providence ordained. But, at the same time, who does not wish that our reforming forefathers had not marred the beauty of their glorious work by penal statutes written in blood?

---

[1] Knox says that none of the clergy made any opposition; but Tytler produces a letter from Lethington to Cecil, in which the Bishops of Dunblane and Dunkeld pray for delay to consider a matter so important. There is still extant a letter from the Archbishop of St Andrews to the Archbishop of Glasgow, dated the 18th of August, in which he hints that he also opposed the reception of the new Confession. See Keith. There is also a suspicion of intimidation having been used, and the archbishop speaks as if he had been threatened with assassination. There is also a letter from Throckmorton, in which he gives an account of the parliament, and mentions the Archbishop of St Andrews as opposing, though not very decisively, the New Faith.

[2] MS. Letter, State-Paper Office, Randolph to Cecil, 19th August 1560, quoted by Tytler, vol. vi.

[3] Knox's History, book iii. Keith's History, book i. chap. xii.

CHAPTER XI.

A CONTRAST has frequently been drawn between the Reformation in England, and the Reformation in Scotland. In the one country we are told, it was effected by the king; in the other, by the people. In the one, it was the product of despotic power; in the other, it resulted from the persuasiveness of preaching. In the one, the movement was more than half political; in the other, it was entirely religious. In the one, the primary object was to abolish the jurisdiction of the Pope; in the other, the object from first to last was to purify the sanctuary. This is only partially true. The Reformation in Scotland was certainly much more a popular movement than it was in England; but in its springs it was not entirely popular, at least in the modern sense of the phrase. We shall approach nearer the truth if we say that it was *baronial* in Scotland as it was *monarchical* in England. In the south of the island, the monarch was omnipotent, and he reformed the Church; in the north, the barons were always a match for the throne, even when a vigorous king sat upon it, and much more than a match for it when it was filled by a child; and so they took the matter in hand, and accomplished the Reformation. Had it not been for the favour of the oligarchy, Knox would have preached in vain, or rather he would never have preached at all.

We have already remarked that the ignorance of the peasantry precluded the possibility of their originating the controversy. But from the first, we find the nobility and gentry, who were now, in a measure, educated men, bidding welcome to the Protestant opinions. Even during the lifetime of James V. such converts were numerous. Beaton is said to have presented to the king a list of three hundred and sixty landed proprietors who were suspected of heresy. So long as the king lived they were kept in check; but he was no sooner gone, than their power began to be seen. The return of the prisoners taken at the Solway, and who, while in England, had conversed with Cranmer at Lambeth, and contracted a fondness for English pensions, Reformation principles, and monastic spoil, increased their numbers and quickened their zeal. They had influence enough to set aside Beaton's pretensions, and raise the Protestant Earl of Arran to the regency.

They had numbers enough to outvote the clergy, and get an act passed allowing the Scriptures to be read in the vulgar tongue. When Wishart began to preach he was protected by powerful barons. When he died, a conspiracy of barons avenged him. Knox's hatred of Rome was nursed in the same baronial halls which had shelted Wishart. He came from Ormiston and Longniddry to thunder against idolatry at St Andrews, which was now held by a few Protestant barons against the might of the country. When he returned from captivity, by barons again was he befriended, and under the shadow of their power he preached. When he was dwelling at Geneva, an exile from his native country, the barons leagued themselves together, assumed the name of the Lords of the Congregation, and began the armed struggle which resulted in the triumph of the Reformation.

Feudalism was still strong in Scotland, and the faith of the lord naturally became the faith of the vassal. It was in those districts of the country where the barons had become Protestant that the populace became Protestant too. Argyll and Glencairn were all-powerful in the western counties, and the western counties were the stronghold of the Reformation. The Earl of Rothes, Lord Lindsay, and the Lord James Stewart had Fife at their devotion; and Fife was for reform. Lord Ruthven was provost of Perth, and Erskine of Dun was provost of Montrose, and his influence extended to Dundee; and Perth, Montrose, and Dundee were conspicuous among the towns for their thorough-going Protestantism. On the other hand, where Huntly was lord, the Reformation made little progress, so much so, that after the mass was abolished by parliament, this potent earl boasted that he could set it up again in three counties; and strange to say, in some of these very districts, Popery has lingered till the present day. Glasgow, Paisley, and the country around them vacillated with the vacillations of the dominant house of Hamilton. Carrick was strongly Protestant in the days of Wishart; it was not so much so in the days of Knox. The explanation is—the old Earl of Cassillis was a staunch Reformer; the new earl was not. In his famous letter from Dieppe, Knox reminded the Scottish nobles of their duty as feudal chiefs—they ought to care for the faith of their followers. In more than one of their manifestoes, the Lords of the Congregation appealed to their feudal position as the vindication of their conduct—their duty to their

dependents and the State constrained them. As feudal barons they brow-beat the regent; and as feudal barons they deposed her.

Knox was unquestionably a great instrument in effecting the Reformation; but we are inclined to regard the preacher as an instrument in the hands of the barons, rather than the barons as instruments in the hands of the preacher. Knox had but to preach, surrounded by his powerful patrons, and his words were like sledge hammers, beating down abbeys, images, and altars. Priests, friars, nuns, were scattered like chaff before the breath of his nostrils. He had but to draw up a Confession of Faith, and the parliament with acclamations received it. But when he differed from the nobles, he became weak as another man. When he suggested a truly wise application of the revenues of the Church, he was treated with derision and contempt. He could pull down the old house, but he could not, as he would, build up the new one. The "Book of Discipline," as we shall shortly see, was not received with the same enthusiasm as the "Book of Doctrines." The needy nobles, the possessors of barren moors and mountains, had been hungering and thirsting for the well-cultivated lands of the churchmen, and now they were not to be baulked of their prey.

The Reformations in the sister countries have been contrasted in another way. The one, it has been said, was constitutional, legal, orderly, without mobbings, without violence; the other was the offspring of treason and rebellion, and characterised throughout by rioting and popular outrage. Here, again, we have the partial truth, not the whole truth. It may have been constitutional for a despotic king and corrupt parliament to make millions believe backwards and forwards at their bidding; but was it right? It may have been treasonable and rebellious for a numerous aristocracy to rise against their sovereign, and insist upon being allowed to worship their own God in their own way; but was it wrong? It were a sorry world in which we live had there been no treasons, no rebellions; had the iron rod of the oppressor never been broken; had the neck been eternally bowed to the yoke. It may be true that in England there were no mobbings, and that the monasteries were there spoiled under the decencies of law, and the ridiculous pretext of voluntary surrenders; but spoiled they nevertheless were, as effectually as in Scotland. It may be true that in

Scotland popular passions were let loose against Religious Houses, venerable for their antiquity, and admired for their architecture; but surely it is much more easy to justify the illegal outrages of a rabble, than the legalised spoliations of a king and his parliament. In England, the monarch did violence to the people; in Scotland, the people did violence to the monarch.

But foreign elements mingled in the Scottish Reformation struggle, and in the end decided it. Around Leith were gathered the interests of Popery and Protestantism; and Leith was held by a French garrison, and besieged by an English army. France was Scotland's ancient ally, England was her nearest neighbour. Had England, the stronger country, always acted with fairness toward Scotland, the weaker one, it had been the plain policy of Scotland to have cherished her friendship. But it had not been so, and Scotland, in her weakness, had sought and obtained the alliance of France. The war of independence had caused wounds which were not easily healed, and the defeat of Flodden and the slaughter of Pinkie had opened them up again. Up to this time, England was both hated and feared. But Elizabeth pursued a different policy, and easily subdued by intrigue a country which all her predecessors had failed to subdue by arms. English spies were in the court and the castle, and a very little English gold went a long way with nobles of great pretensions and slender means. The English alliance grew in favour—the French alliance declined. The French secured the queen, and she continued a Papist; the English prevailed with the people, and they all turned Protestant.

Even before Protestantism had received its parliamentary establishment, it had, in a measure, taken possession of the country. The treaty of Leith was no sooner signed, and the French and English troops withdrawn, than the few preachers of the Reformation who could be found were located in the different towns, to keep alive the zeal of the populace. John Knox was appointed to Edinburgh, Christopher Goodman to St Andrews, Adam Heriot to Aberdeen, John Row to Perth, Paul Methven to Jedburgh, William Christison to Dundee, David Ferguson to Dunfermline, and David Lindsay to Leith. Besides these ordinary ministers, the primitive Protestant Church of Scotland recognised a class of office-bearers called superintendents, appointed, says Knox, to see "that all things in

the Church were carried with order, and well;" and of these John Spottiswood was appointed for Lothian, John Winram for Fife, John Willock for Glasgow, Erskine of Dun for Angus and Mearns, and John Carswell for Argyll and the Isles.[1] These eight ministers and five superintendents formed the first staff of the Reformed Church.

The parliament had received a new creed, and had passed acts abolishing the mass and the jurisdiction of the Pope within the realm. But still the work was but half done. The old Church had been thrown down—a new one must be reared out of its ruins. It was not enough that preachers should perambulate the country, or be settled in towns; provision must be made for their maintenance, rules must be laid down for their conduct, legal authority must be given to their acts. Well-nigh the half of the whole wealth of the kingdom had belonged to the Romish Church; and the Romish Church was no more. What was to be done with it? The mass was prohibited, the invocation of saints was prohibited, the whole service of the ancient worship was prohibited. What was now to be substituted in their stead? The jurisdiction of Rome was at an end. What other jurisdiction was to succeed it? These questions must be solved; and accordingly, soon after the dissolution of parliament, a commission was given to Knox, Spottiswood, Winram, Willock, and Row, to draw up a Book of Policy for the Protestant Church.[2]

The product of their labour remains, and is generally known as the "FIRST BOOK OF DISCIPLINE." No document could possibly throw more light upon the opinions of the Reformers. It is, in fact, the plan of the temple they designed to rear. If in anything our Church, as it now stands, differs from the "Book of Discipline"—if it has not the breadth of foundation, or height of pinnacle, or richness of ornament there indicated, it is because the after execution has fallen short of the original plan—it is because the builders who raised the fabric had not the same views as the architects who designed it. The "First Book of Discipline" is divided into sixteen chapters, but we shall endeavour to explain the ecclesiastical polity which it shadows forth under three heads—The Office-bearers of the New Church, their election and admission;

---

[1] Knox's Hist., book iii. Spottiswood's Hist., lib. iii.

[2] The First Book of Discipline is addressed to "The Great Councell of Scotland now admitted to the Regiment, by the providence of God, and by the Common consent of the Estates thereof," &c.

The Worship and Discipline of the New Church; The Patrimony of the Old Church, and its appropriation by the New.

I. *The Office-bearers of the New Church.*

Of these there were four orders—the superintendent, the minister, the elder, and the deacon.

The "First Book of Discipline" divides the whole country into ten dioceses, which were to be presided over by ten superintendents. Their duty was to erect kirks, appoint pastors in places hitherto unprovided, and give the occasional benefit of a learned ministry in localities which could not otherwise enjoy that privilege at all. Their labours are minutely detailed. They must preach at least thrice every week; they must not remain in the chief town of the diocese, where their own church and residence were, longer than three or four months at a time: when on a visitation, they must tarry in no one place longer than twenty days; they must not only preach, but examine the life, diligence, and behaviour of the ministers, the order of the churches, and the manners of the people: they must see how the youth were instructed and the poor provided for; and, finally, take cognizance of any crimes which called for the correction of the Kirk.

These magnates of the early Church have been the subject of fierce debate between Episcopal and Presbyterian writers. The Episcopal controversialist maintains that the Reformed Church of Scotland was Episcopal at the first, and that its Presbyterianism was the growth of a subsequent age. As we are sometimes told that presbyter is just priest written large, so we are told that the superintendent was just the bishop done into Latin. On the other hand, the Presbyterian disputant affirms that the superintendent of the Scotch Church was quite a different functionary from the bishop of the Roman and Anglican Churches; and, moreover, that the office was designed to be temporary, and not perpetual. In a controversy like this, where we have authoritative documents upon which to proceed, there is no great difficulty in arriving at the precise truth. It must be conceded to the Episcopalian that the names coincide in meaning; that superintendent is nothing but the Latin form of the Greek *episcopos.* It must further be conceded, that the superintendent, like the bishop, had a diocese entrusted to his care, and that the duties imposed upon the one in many respects agreed with those discharged by the other: he was to make a periodical visita-

tion of the churches in his diocese, and set everything in order. The ministers and readers, the elders and deacons, were amenable to his jurisdiction. But here concession must stop: here the similarity of the bishop and the superintendent ceases. In other respects there was a great gulph between them. The genuine bishop required to rise through the diaconate and priesthood to his episcopate; the superintendent might at once be elevated from the laity to his superintendency. John Erskine of Dun was a country gentleman when he was admitted superintendent of Angus and Mearns.[1] The bishop could be consecrated only by bishops; the superintendent was admitted to his charge by presbyters. John Knox presided at the admission both of Spottiswood and Erskine. To the bishop belonged exclusively the power of ordination—through him the apostolic virtue was transmitted to the different office-bearers in the Church; to the superintendent belonged no such exclusive privileges. The power of ordination belonged equally to every minister in the Church. The bishop was raised above the control of the presbyter; but the superintendent was made subject to the censure and correction of the ministers and elders of the province over which he presided, and no inconsistency or absurdity was felt as belonging to the arrangement. Would any stickler for a canonical episcopacy recognise such a superintendent as a true bishop? a bishop who had never been a deacon, never a priest; a bishop consecrated by a presbyter; a bishop with no exclusive powers of ordination, and made subject to the clergy of his diocese?

The language of the "Book of Discipline" seems to imply that the office of a superintendent was not designed to be perpetual in the Church. It was a temporary expedient to meet the exigencies of a country suddenly deprived of its ancient priesthood, and not yet supplied with Protestant preachers.[2] In such a time, the creation of such an office was most politic and wise, it could scarcely have been dispensed

---

[1] This, however, leads us back to the time when Ambrose was taken from the courts of law, even against his will, and at once set upon the Episcopal throne of Milan.

[2] "We have thought good to signify to your honours such reasons as moved us to make difference betwixt preachers *at this time*. . . . We have thought it a thing most expedient *at this time*, that from the whole number of godly and learned men, now presently in this realm, be selected ten or twelve, to whom charge and commandment should be given to plant and erect kirks," &c. (First Book of Discipline, chap. vi.)

with; and he must be blindly wedded to Presbyterian parity who would grudge these Presbyterian bishops the superiority they enjoyed over their brethren. That they did enjoy a superiority it were useless to deny.

Next to the superintendent came the *minister*, whose office, as defined in the "Book of Discipline," agrees exactly with what it is now. But as men of sufficient learning to supply all the parishes in the country with ministers could not at once be found, men of inferior attainments, denominated *readers*, were to be temporarily employed in the destitute districts. It was the duty of these to read the Common Prayers and the Scriptures to the people, but they were forbidden to administer the sacraments. They might also follow up their reading with some suitable exhortation, and if they attained to fluency in this exercise, they might then, with the approbation of the superintendent, be raised to the full *status* of ministers. Thus this system of readerships not merely supplied a temporary want, but served as a school in which men were trained for the ministerial work, for no college curriculum had as yet been prescribed. Ministers are specially forbidden to haunt the court, to be members of the Council, or to board in taverns or ale-houses.

The *elders* were to be "men of best knowledge in God's Word, and cleanest life, men faithful and of most honest conversation that could be found in the Church." Their duty was "to assist the ministers in all public affairs of the kirk, to wit, in determining and judging causes, in giving admonition to the licentious liver, in having respect to the manners and conversation of all men within their charge." "They ought also to take heed to the life, manners, diligence, and study of their ministers. If he be worthy of admonition, they must admonish him; of correction, they must correct him; and if he be worthy of deposition, they, with the consent of the kirk and superintendent, may depose him, so that his crime deserve so." The *deacons* were "to receive the rents and gather the alms of the kirk, to keep and distribute the same as by the ministers and kirk shall be appointed; they may also assist in judgment with the ministers and elders; and may be admitted to read in assembly if they be required, and be able thereto." The elders and deacons were to be elected only for a year, lest they should presume too much; and no stipend was to be assigned them for their labours, which were not deemed to be such as to withdraw them from their usual employments.

Ordinary vocation is said to consist of three parts--election, examination, and admission. The "Book of Discipline" suggests that the superintendents should be chosen by the Secret Council, with the approbation of the gentlemen and burgesses of their dioceses; and that the ministers should be chosen by their parishioners. Being duly elected, the same course was to be pursued in regard to both superintendents and ministers; their life, their doctrines, and their capabilities of edifying the people were to be tested; a sermon was to be preached; admonitions were to be addressed to all the parties concerned; prayer was to be offered up; and the presentee declared to be admitted to his charge. The imposition of hands was forbidden: "for albeit the apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremony we judge not necessary." To preach the Word or administer the sacraments without a proper call, is declared to be worthy of death.

II. *The Worship and Discipline of the New Church.* It is declared to be necessary that the Word should be preached, the sacraments administered, common prayers publicly made, the young and the ignorant instructed, and offenders punished; it is declared to be profitable, but not necessary, that psalms should be sung, that certain portions of Scripture should be read when there was no sermon, and that certain days should be observed on which the people might assemble in the churches. It is recommended that, in the great towns, there should be either sermon or common prayers, with some reading of the Scriptures every day; and that in the smaller towns, one day beside the Sunday should be set apart for this purpose. On the Sunday the Word was to be preached, the sacraments administered, the children publicly catechized in the audience of the people, and the whole day observed as sacred. All holidays are abolished. All vows of continence, and all assumption of religious apparel, are declared to be sinful. All monuments and places of idolatry are ordered to be destroyed.

Besides the meetings for the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, the "Book of Discipline" directs, that in every town "where schools and repair of learned men are," there should be a weekly meeting for prophesying or interpreting the Scriptures. In these meetings every man was to have liberty to speak, to offer interpretations of hard passages, to suggest doubts, to solve difficulties; but not to

launch out into anything like preaching. The ministers in the neighbourhood were to attend these prophesyings, and at the close of the meeting to communicate to those who had spoken their opinion of the manner in which they had handled the matter. In this way it is said "shall the kirk have knowledge and judgment of the graces, gifts, and utterances of every man within their body; the simple and such as have somewhat profited shall be encouraged daily to study and to proceed in knowledge; and the whole kirk shall be edified."

In the Policy of the Church it is recommended that the sacrament of the Supper should be administered four times every year, the communicants sitting at a table, and partaking both of the bread and the wine, while the minister recited to them some comfortable passages of holy writ touching the death of Christ, and the benefits which flowed from it. Before being admitted to the Lord's table, persons were to be examined if they could say the Lord's prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. The sacrament of baptism was to be administered in the church at convenient times. The use of oil, salt, wax, spittle, conjuration, and crossing is abolished, and the pure element of water alone was to be employed. Marriage was to be performed after the proclamation of banns upon a Sunday, and in the open face and public audience of the Church. The burial of the dead was to take place without any singing of mass, placebo, or dirge. No ceremony whatever was to be used, no funeral sermon was to be preached, but "the dead committed to the grave with such gravity and sobriety as those that be present may seem to fear the judgments of God, and to hate sin, which is the cause of death."

In the "Book of Discipline" there is frequent reference to the Common Prayers and the Order of Geneva. This liturgical form, it would appear, had now begun to supersede the First Book of Edward VI., which had hitherto been used by the Scotch Reformers as a guide in their devotions. It had been printed together with the metrical version of the Psalms, and now received the stamp of authority from the "Book of Discipline."[1] It was chiefly the composition of John Knox, and was used by him at Geneva. It contained morning and evening prayers, an order of baptism, an order for the administration of the Lord's Supper, a form of marriage, a visitation of the sick, and there were afterwards added to it a form for the

---

[1] When reference is made to the Psalm Book at this period and for long afterwards, the liturgy with the psalms attached is meant.

election of superintendents and ministers, and an order for excommunication and public repentance. The officiating minister was allowed by the rubric to deviate from the forms of prayer prescribed, but still these were to be considered as his guide, and we need not hesitate to admit that this liturgy was generally used for many years in the Reformed Church of Scotland. Some of the prayers, for transparency of diction and beauty of piety, will compare with the much-lauded compositions of the Anglican Prayer-Book; but in general they are prolix and involved, and appear never to have taken much hold upon the hearts of the people. The Lord's prayer is frequently introduced, and the whole compilation is characterized by good sense and sobriety of religious feeling. The rubric instructs us that the Church-service began with a prayer, containing a confession of sin; then a portion of the Scriptures was read; then a psalm was sung; then an extemporaneous prayer was offered up by the minister; then followed the sermon, a prayer, a psalm; and finally the congregation was dismissed with the benediction.[1]

The discipline of the early Church was stern—perhaps too stern for frail human nature. Every kind of immorality was taken cognisance of—drunkenness, profane swearing, impurity, excess in eating, in drinking, or in dress, oppression of the poor, the use of a false weight or measure, wanton words, licentious living, everything which fell short of the perfect law. Heresy, idolatry, adultery, and several other crimes were pronounced worthy of death, and it was declared to be the duty of the civil magistrate to see the sentence carried into execution. In the case of offenders who continued obstinate and unrepentant notwithstanding the admonitions of the Church, the sentence of excommunication was to be pronounced. This sentence was scarcely less dreadful than the anathema of Rome. When it was pronounced, none, saving his wife and family,

---

[1] So early as 1567 the Prayer-Book was translated into Gaelic by John Carswell, Bishop of the Isles, and is said to have been the first Gaelic book ever printed. It was entitled "Foirm na Nurrnuidheadh," or Forms of Prayer. The bishop knew that this book would be treated with ridicule by the bards who still continued Papists, and who would regard printing as an innovation. "Well do I know," said he, in his Apologetic Introduction, "that the Papists especially, and above all the old satirical priests, will vomit malice against me, and that my work will procure me from them only scandal and reproach." A curious and highly-interesting notice of this work will be found in Leyden's "Scottish Descriptive Poems," &c. The only copy of Carswell's translation known to exist is said to be in the possession of the Duke of Argyll.

might have any dealings, in eating or drinking, in buying or selling, in saluting or talking, with the excommunicated man. He was to be as one accursed, and cut off from all society. When the delinquent, however, was brought to repentance, he was to be absolved of his sin, and received back into the bosom of the Church. The "Book of Discipline" recommends that "a solemn and special prayer should be drawn for the purpose, that the thing might be more gravely done;" and accordingly an order of excommunication and of public repentance was afterwards added to the liturgy. It shows the discipline of the Church to have been much more formal and operose then than it is now; perhaps more faithful, certainly more severe. The form of absolution, however, would now be pronounced papistical, as it is not declarative, but authoritative. The minister authoritatively absolves the penitent of his sin, and pronounces it to be loosed in heaven. The "Book of Discipline" says nothing of the government of the Church by kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synods, and General Assemblies; but it is easy to trace in it the rudimental forms of all these courts. The minister required to meet with his elders and deacons; out of this grew the kirk-session. The ministers within six miles of the notable towns required to meet at the prophesyings or weekly exercises, and neighbour ministers required to meet with each other for several other purposes; here was the embryo presbytery. The superintendent required to meet with the clergy of his diocese for ordering many things connected with the government of the Church; this was the genesis of the synod. From the first year of its existence the whole Church met in General Assembly.

III. *The patrimony of the Old Church, and its appropriation by the New.*

The "Book of Discipline" proposed to remit all mortuary dues and Easter offerings. All the other possessions, rents, and revenues of the ancient Church, whether they belonged to bishoprics, religious houses, or parishes, were to be appropriated by the new establishment, and lifted as they fell due by the deacons. Being thus appropriated and realised, they were to be applied to three great purposes—the maintenance of the ministry, the education of youth, and the support of the poor. For these purposes had the hierarchy been endowed; and these very purposes did the Protestant clergy now propose to fulfil.[1]

---

[1] The Romanists themselves acknowledged that these endowments had been received for these three purposes. "Quhidder cumis it be zour ex-

It was the smallest possible alienation of funds doted by piety for particular purposes, and such dotations ought ever to be regarded as peculiarly sacred. The scheme does honour to Knox, and proves that, with all his roughness, he was possessed of a great and liberal mind. He appears more truly great in his attempts to build up the new Church, though therein he failed, than in his efforts to throw down the old one, though therein he succeeded. But let us examine the plan a little more narrowly.

It is suggested that the superintendent should have a stipend of about six chalders beer, nine chalders meal, three chalders oats, and six hundred merks of money, to be increased or decreased at the discretion of the prince and council of the realm. It is suggested that the minister should have at least forty bolls of meal, twenty-six bolls of malt, to find his house in bread and drink, and an allowance of money beside, to be fixed yearly by his congregation. The readers were to have a salary of forty or fifty merks, according as they might agree with the parishioners among whom they laboured. It must be confessed that here there was no greed or grasping on the part of the clergy; the allowances they asked for themselves were extremely moderate. The stipend of the superintendent is not greater than a city living at the present day, and the stipend of the minister, though not so precisely defined, we may conclude was not more liberal than that now enjoyed by the ministers of rural parishes. "The Book of Discipline," however, demanded that some provision should be made for the widows and children of those who devoted themselves to the ministry, upon salaries which did not enable them to accumulate wealth. The sons of the clergy were to have the freedom of the towns adjacent to the parishes in which their fathers had lived and laboured. If they had an aptitude for learning they were to be maintained at the schools, and have a bursary in the college; if they had no such aptitude, they were to be put to some useful trade. The daughters were to be virtuously brought up, and honestly dowered when they came to maturity, at the discretion of the Kirk.

The second part of the scheme was the education of the youth of the country, a duty which hitherto the Romish priesthood had performed, though in an imperfect way. The "Book

hortation or nocht that mony desyris the kirk-landis anis dedicat to God, for sustentation of godly ministeris, puir studentis, and feble and waik indigentis," &c. (Ninian Wingate, 62.)

of Discipline" proposes that to every church there should be attached a school; that in every large town, especially in the towns of the superintendents, there should be erected a college or grammar school; and that the Universities of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen should be liberally endowed. Here, then, we have a parochial system of education chalked out, a system whose foundations were laid amid such humble literature as the peasantry could receive, but whose pinnacles reached to the highest regions of learning, a system starting from the village school and ending with the university. It was the foreshadow of the system which was afterwards realised in our country, but the shadow was more perfect than the reality. It is worked out in the "Book of Discipline" with great minuteness, and while we may not approve of its every detail, in all its leading outlines it discovers a genius for policy worthy of the greatest statesman.

The third part of the scheme was the sustenance of the poor. The Christian Church has ever considered the poor to be the special objects of its care. In Romish times many hospitals had been founded for the reception of the sick, the infirm, and the indigent; and every monastery, in fact, was a kind of alms-house. When the Reformation was on the eve of being accomplished, bishops bemoaned the misfortunes that would befall the poor; but the Reformers showed their knowledge of Christian duty, and their respect for the intention of the donors of the Church-property, when they resolved to take the poor under their charge. Both before and after the Reformation, Scotland seems to have swarmed with beggars. Among these there were not only the aged and sick, but strong, sturdy vagabonds, who haunted the public roads and entered the farm-houses, and received alms more from fear than from charity. The "Book of Discipline" proposed that the able-bodied should be compelled to work, but that the aged and infirm should be made to return to their native parishes, and be there provided for.

The Church is said to have anciently possessed one-half of the whole property of the kingdom. Even a moiety of this, had it been carefully preserved and improved, would have abundantly maintained the ecclesiastical, educational, and pauper establishments of the kingdom, and the community been saved from three of the heaviest taxes which now press upon it. The gospel would be preached, every child educated, the poor provided for, without cost. No one would lose anything;

only some proprietors would never have possessed their extensive domains. Some great lords would be but country gentlemen with small estates; and others might rejoice in ancient titles, but lack the broad acres which now give them support. Public officers, and not private factors, would be lifting the rents of the monasteries; and yet the present holders could not be said to have lost what, according to our supposition, they never possessed. The community would have reaped, as it ought to have done, the benefit of the Church's accumulated wealth.

The same agencies which deposited the endowments of the Roman hierarchy are operating still; and if sufficient time be allowed, the accumulation will again become equally great. Men are every now and then dying and leaving money to build a church, to found an hospital, to endow a school. The funds thus devoted must go on increasing—they cannot decrease; and we can contemplate the time when our ecclesiastical, educational, and pauper establishments will be sustained by this source alone, without need of assessments. How sad if the few were again to sweep away the wealth thus slowly accumulated for the benefit of the many!

From the first brush of the Reformation, it was evident that the Church's property would have an important influence upon the struggle. The hungry nobles were coveting the well-fed churchmen. So early as 1543, the Regent Arran confessed to Sadler that so many great men were Papists, that unless the sin of covetousness made them Reformers, he saw no other way in which the Reformation could be effected.[1] When the battle commenced, the barons instantly began to relieve the churchmen of the trouble of lifting their rents. When the victory was won, Knox perceived the danger of the Church being not merely purged of its idolatry, but stripped of its possessions, and turned out naked upon the streets; and therefore, while the parliament of 1560 was yet sitting, he began a course of lectures upon Haggai, and we can conceive the indignant tones in which he demanded of the barons who filled the nave of St Gile's—"Is it a time for you, O ye, to dwell in your ceiled houses, and this house lie waste? Go up to the mountain and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the Lord. The silver is mine, and the gold is mine, saith the Lord of hosts. The glory of this latter house shall be greater than of

---

[1] Sadler, State Papers, &c., vol. i. Keith's Hist., book i. chap. iii.

the former, and in this place will I give peace." But if Knox could declaim, there were barons who could sneer at his declamation. "We may now forget ourselves," said Maitland, "and bear the barrow to build the house of God."[1]

When the "Book of Discipline" was presented to the Privy Council for its approval, the same spirit became still more manifest. Maitland again had his sneer, and declared the whole affair to be "a devout imagination." Knox now suddenly found himself in the midst of a den of thieves, and he broke out with scorching sarcasm. "Some," says he, "were licentious, some had greedily gripped the possessions of the Church, and others thought that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat; yea, and that before that ever He was hanged, as by the preachers they were oft rebuked. The chief great man that had professed Christ Jesus, and refused to subscribe the 'Book of Discipline,' was the Lord Erskine; and no wonder, for, besides that he has a very Jezebel to his wife, if the poor, the schools, and the ministry of the Church had their own, his kitchen would lack two parts and more of that which he unjustly now possesseth. Assuredly some of us have wondered how men that profess godliness could of so long continuance hear the threatenings of God against thieves and against their houses, and knowing themselves guilty in such things as were openly rebuked, and that they never had remorse of conscience, neither yet intended to restore anything of that which long they had stolen and reft. There were none within the realm more unmerciful to the poor ministers than were they which had greatest rents of the churches; but in that we have perceived the old proverb to be true, 'Nothing can suffice a wretch;' and again, 'The belly hath no ears.'"[2]

The Secret Council, as a body, could never be induced to give its approval to the "First Book of Discipline." But on the 17th of January 1561, thirty-three barons and proselytized prelates put their names as individual subscribers to a document, in which they gave it their sanction, and promised to do their best to carry it into execution.[3] The subscription was useless, and in many cases was insincere. Thus this plan for the building of the second temple was discarded, simply because it proposed to apply ecclesiastical property to ecclesiastical uses. It might have been supposed that barons so zealous for religion would have themselves been religious,

---

[1] Knox's History, book iii.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

and that being religious they would have been honest, but it was not so. In the case of many, a desire to clutch the Church's lands and tithes had much more to do with making them reformers than any love for Calvinism. A knowledge of men, and of the motives which concur in promoting the best of causes, will lessen our surprise, and let us see that the same thing has happened more than once in the history of the world. But though the "First Book of Discipline" did not receive the sanction of the parliament or council, it was acted upon by the Church, so far as the Church could act upon it. The ecclesiastical arrangements were carried out, though the ecclesiastical revenues could not be touched. It is said that the Archbishop of St Andrews, when he saw the day lost, and the ruin of his party irretrievable, sent a message to Knox, urging him, while he changed the doctrines of the Church, to maintain its ancient policy, as in that way only could he hope to preserve its property; but Knox was too thorough a Reformer to listen to the advice.[1]

On the 20th December 1560, the first GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the Reformed Church of Scotland met in Magdalen Chapel, in the Cowgate of Edinburgh. It consisted of but forty-one members, of whom only six were ministers. They sat as "the ministers and commissioners of the particular kirks of Scotland, convened upon the things which are to set forward God's glory, and the weal of His Kirk in this realm."[2] The chief business of this Assembly was to give its approval to a number of persons who were recommended to it as readers, ministers, and superintendents. Acts were also passed in regard to the laws of consanguinity, the election of ministers, elders, and deacons, the confirmation of testaments; and ordaining that those who had borne office in the Popish Church, and were of honest conversation, should be supported with the alms of the Kirk, as other poor; that the parliament should be petitioned to admit none to public offices but such as were of the Reformed religion, and to punish sharply all sayers and hearers of mass. This Assembly seems to have continued its sittings during seven days, when it adjourned to meet on the 15th of January 1561.

Of the Assembly appointed to meet in January, if it ever met, we have no record; but on the 15th of that month, a Convention of the Estates was held, in which grave matters

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. iii.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 1. Keith, book iii. chap. i.

affecting the Church were debated. It was in this convention that the "Book of Discipline" was first examined, and then cast overboard. But the nobles, while refusing to sanction the new ecclesiastical policy, wished to have their faith confirmed by a disputation on the controverted points between the Papists and Protestants. There were therefore summoned into their presence, on the Romish side, John Lesley, Official of Aberdeen, and shortly afterwards Bishop of Ross, Alexander Anderson, Professor of Theology in Aberdeen, Patrick Myrtom, and James Strachan; and on the side of the Reformers, John Knox, John Willock, and Christopher Goodman. It was on the mass that the debate principally hinged. We have an account of it from two of the combatants, Knox and Lesley, and it is amusing to contrast their opposite descriptions of this polemical passage-at-arms. Knox declares that Anderson, who began the combat, was quickly silenced; and that when Lesley came to his rescue, he could only say that he knew nothing but the canon law, where the great reasons for everything were *nolumus* and *volumus;* words which Knox instantly fastened upon him as a nickname. Lesley, on the other hand, relates that Anderson reasoned so learnedly, consistently, and piously, that the Catholics were confirmed, and the heretics confounded, and that, after that exhibition, no one dared to challenge him or any other Romanist to an encounter regarding the mysteries of his faith. Lesley adds that the nobles revenged themselves upon the triumphant Catholics by compelling them to remain in the city, and give attendance upon the sermons of the Protestant preachers, as if, says he, with a bitter sneer, the pandering speeches of these paltry rhetoricians could convince men whom all their arguments had failed to move.[1]

In the month of May, the second General Assembly of which we have any record assembled in the Tolbooth at Edinburgh. It resolved that a petition should be presented to the Privy Council, praying that all monuments of idolatry should be destroyed, and all persons guilty of it proceeded against according to act of parliament; that provision should be made for the superintendents, ministers, and readers, and punishments appointed for those who contemned their authority; that all despisers of the sacraments should be punished; that no letters of session should be given for the payment of

---

[1] Knox's History, book iii. Lesley, lib. x.

teinds, without the special provision that enough was retained for the maintenance of the ministry; that no judge should proceed upon any precept at the instance of persons who had already obtained feus of vicarages, parson-houses, or church-yards; that no warrants of any kind should be put in force till the stipends specified in the "Book of Discipline" for the maintenance of the ministry should be first consigned in the hands of the principal parishioners; and, finally, that punishment should be inflicted upon any who might purchase, or publish within the realm, papal bulls.[1]

These articles of complaint and petition are highly significant, and show the means already being taken to alienate the property of the Church. Knox says that the Lords of Privy Council granted the prayer of the petition; but we have little evidence that they acted upon any part of it, except that which related to the demolition of the monasteries.[2] With regard to these, they went to work with amazing alacrity. The execution of the work was intrusted to the Earls of Arran, Argyll, and Glencairn, in the western counties; and to the Lord James in the north; and, if we may believe Spottiswood, a pitiful devastation ensued.

It is undoubtedly more difficult to defend this demolition of Religious Houses than that which preceded it, notwithstanding that the one was done under the pretext of law, and the other in defiance of it. In the first case, the contest was raging, the issue was doubtful, men's passions were up, and the mob was not to be restrained; in the second, the victory had been won, the flood of angry feeling had somewhat abated, and it was not the rascal rabble, but the lords of parliament who did the work. At the same time, it must be allowed that fear lest Popery should regain its lost ground was still strong, and that the public mind was in a state of intense excitement. These monasteries, if allowed to stand, might yet be re-occupied. It is also certain that the havoc made was not nearly so great as is frequently supposed. We have still remaining the commission issued for the purging of the Cathedral of Dunkeld, in which the Lairds of Arntilly and Kinvaid are instructed to pass to it incontinent, to take down the images, and bringing them out to the church-yard, to burn them publicly, to cast down the altars, and remove every vestige of idolatry; but, at the same time, to be careful to do no damage to the desks, windows, or doors, either in respect

---

[1] Keith, book iii. chap. i.

[2] Knox's History, book iv.

of the glass-work or iron-work.[1] This, it must be acknowledged, was only a reasonable and needful reformation, and we shall understand it still better if we take it in conjunction with the chapter in the "First Book of Discipline," in which it is declared that the churches ought to be repaired in a manner fitting the majesty of God and the commodity of the people, and provided with doors, glass windows, thatch or slate, a bell, a pulpit, a basin for baptizing, and tables for administering the Lord's Supper.[2] There was no antipathy to churches of hoary antiquity and stately architecture; it was only monasteries that were to be destroyed, and that part of the furniture of the churches which the Protestants deemed to be idolatrous.

Immediately after the dissolution of the parliament which accepted the reformed Confession of Faith, Sir James Sandilands, Preceptor of the Knights of St John, had been despatched to France to obtain the queen's ratification of its acts. He was received with cold courtesy; his request was refused; and the Cardinal of Lorraine took an opportunity of saying to him, that he was surprised to find the head of an ecclesiastical military order so forgetful of his vows as to come upon such an errand. The queen, moreover, complained that a poor gentleman of secondary rank should have come to her, while a splendid legation, consisting of the Earls of Glencairn and Morton, and the Laird of Lethington, had been sent to Elizabeth. She saw but too clearly that she was supplanted in the affections of her subjects, and that the Queen of England had more influence in Scotland than its rightful sovereign. Rumours of her displeasure reached Scotland, and the worst was apprehended. French troops might again be landed; English assistance might not again be obtained; and despotic power might occupy the throne, and force an odious religion upon a reluctant people. These fears, however, were quickly dissipated by the death of Francis II. It was at once seen that this event would entirely change the current of State affairs. Mary was now a widow. She no longer swayed the French sceptre, or had at her command the armies and resources of a kingdom more powerful than her own. All this had passed to another; and it was already anticipated that she would soon return to her native dominions.

Dec. 4, 1560.

---

[1] This document is given in the Notes to Dr M'Crie's Life of Knox.

[2] First Book of Discipline, chap. xv.

Early in 1561 two distinguished personages were hurrying from Scotland to France by different routes. The one took shipping at Aberdeen, and proceeded by sea; the other posted southwards through England, pausing at the Court of St James's on his way. Both were Churchmen. The one was John Lesley, Official of Aberdeen; the other was James Stewart, Prior of St Andrews. The former was hastening to bespeak the favour of his queen for the Catholics; the latter, to entreat his sister to consult her own happiness, and the stability of her government, by seeking the support of the Protestants. Lesley beat his rival on the road by a day, and had the first word with his sovereign. He was kindly received, and advised her to land at Aberdeen and put herself at the head of the Catholics of the north, but he does not seem to have obtained her confidence. Her brother, though he was a bastard, she received with all a sister's openness and affection; and he rewarded her confidence by retailing their interviews to the English ambassador. Mary was willing to forgive her brother all the past; but she was most anxious he should make his peace with Rome. The Guises used all their influence to bring this about; let him only return to his ecclesiastical habit, and he might have a cardinal's hat, abbeys, priories, anything his soul desired.[1] The Lord James remained firm—he would not be a renegade—and for this we must honour him. However, he was not firm for nought; he had already sought and obtained a pension from England, and at this very time we find the English ambassador earnestly pressing his claims upon the English queen. He soon obtained an earldom; people whispered he sought a crown.

After some hesitation and delay, the widowed Mary resolved to return to her ancestral kingdom. She applied to Elizabeth for a safe passport, but it was refused with rage, for she had cleverly evaded confirming the Treaty of Edinburgh, in which Elizabeth was acknowledged as Queen of England—a thing about which she was particularly tender and touchy. The Scottish queen was not to be deterred, though she had reason to suspect that evil was meditated against her, and embarking at Calais on the 14th of August, she gazed at the receding shores while she could, but soon lost sight for ever of the joyous country where she had spent the only period of her life destined to be happy. The English cruisers were in the

---

[1] Tytler's History, vol. vi. Keith, book ii.

Channel eager to intercept her, but she happily passed them in a fog, and arrived at Leith on a dark, stormy morning, five days after she had set sail. Her nobility and people received her with rude pomp, and conducted her to her Palace of Holyroodhouse. In the evening numerous bonfires blazed a welcome, and "a company of most honest men, with instruments of music, gave their salutations at her chamber window."[1] Mary was good-natured enough to declare that she was delighted with their strains, and bid them come and repeat them on the following night; but the celebrated chronicler, Brantome, who was one of her company, declares the music was abominable, and performed upon wretched fiddles and rebecs.

But Sunday came, and on Sunday the queen, like a good Catholic, must hear mass; and to hear mass in Scotland was a crime worthy of death. The Master of Lindsay, and some of the Fife Reformers, had gathered about the palace. The poor man who carried in the candles for the altar trembled in every joint when he looked at their threatening aspects. He heard them muttering, "the idolatrous priest shall die." The chapel would certainly have been invaded, but the Lord James had taken up his post at the door, and would allow no one to enter. He declared, with much solemnity, that he had placed himself there that no Scotchman might pollute his eyes with the abominable thing. A strange humour must have flickered about his mouth when he said it. The service was performed, and no mischief done; and the officiating priest safely conducted back to his lodgings between the Abbot of Coldingham and the Abbot of Holyroodhouse, both Protestants, and both illegitimate brothers of the queen.[2] But in the afternoon the crowd became greater, and a riot was apprehended. In these circumstances the Privy Council met, and, as the result of their deliberations, a proclamation was published the next day at the market-cross, forbidding any one, under pain of death, to make any alteration in the state of religion as it existed upon her Majesty's arrival in her dominions, or to assault upon any pretence any of her Majesty's attendants, either within or without the palace.[3]

This proclamation had two sides—a Protestant and a Popish. Many regarded it as a great triumph of Protestantism, for it was its first regal recognition in the realm; others

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Keith's History, book iii. chap. ii.

regarded it as a revival of Popery, for it protected the queen's Frenchmen and priests in celebrating their masses. When the herald had read the proclamation, the Earl of Arran, an excitable young man, who had sought the hand of Elizabeth and been refused, who had aspired to the heart of Mary with little hope of success, and who subsequently went mad, stepped forward and protested against any protection being given to the queen's domestics in their idolatrous worship, as the law of the Lord and the law of the land had alike declared it to be deserving of death.[1] On the Sunday following Knox took up the same theme, and declared from the pulpit that one mass was more fearful to him than if ten thousand armed enemies were landed in any part of the realm. The courtiers, however, only laughed at his alarm, and jeeringly said that it was quite beside his text.[2] In deep dolour Knox wrote to Calvin pouring into his bosom his griefs and his fears, and asking his advice (but it is probable the letter never reached its destination).[3]

Before Mary had left France she had heard of Knox, and feared him, perhaps hated him.[4] Rumours of his sermon now reached the palace, and she resolved to send for and try if nothing could be made of this wild and outspoken man. The long-bearded Reformer came, and was admitted to an audience with the queen—a girl of nineteen, already a widow, but one of the most beautiful women in Europe. There they stood opposite to one another in the ancient halls of Holyrood. There were none present to witness what passed but the Lord James, and two gentlemen in waiting who remained at the far end of the room. The queen began the interview by charging Knox with stirring up her subjects against her mother and herself; with writing a book against the government of women; and with doing all he did by necromancy. In regard to the first charge, Knox protested that he had done nothing more than rebuked idolatry, and preached the Word of God in sincerity. In regard to the second, he confessed that he had written the treatise referred to, and that it contained his opinions. "Then," said the queen, "you think that I have

---

[1] Keith's History, book iii. chap. ii. Knox's History, book iv.

[2] Knox's History, book iv. Thomas Randolph in a letter to Sir Nicolas Throckmorton refers to the Mass, the Proclamation, and the Sermon. (Eliz. vol. vi. No. 61A).

[3] Teulet, book ii. p. 12. Burton, chap. xli.

[4] Letter in Appendix to Tytler's History, vol. vi.

no just authority." Knox parried this thrust by stating, that philosophers were privileged to entertain speculative opinions opposed to the existing order of things, as was Plato when he published his "Republic." For himself, he declared that he was willing to live as a peaceable subject of her Majesty's government, and that his book was provoked by the persecutions of Mary of England. "But," cried Mary of Scotland, "you speak of women in general." The Reformer allowed that his argument was general, but urged that, seeing it had not caused her Majesty any trouble, and was not likely to do so, it was impolitic to stir it at all. Then referring to the charge of necromancy, he appealed to all the congregations to whom he had preached to refute the charge. "But seeing," he concluded, "that the wicked of the world said my Master, the Lord Jesus, was possessed with Beelzebub, I must patiently bear, albeit that I, wretched sinner, am unjustly accused." The queen now shifted her ground, and asked if he had not taught the people another religion than that of their princes; and "how," said she, "can that doctrine be of God, seeing God commandeth subjects to obey their princes." Knox had now clearly the truth on his side, and he argued that, as religion came not from princes, but from the eternal God, so to God only were men answerable for it. He appealed to the Israelites in Egypt, to Daniel and his fellows in Babylon, to Christ and His apostles in the Roman Empire. "Yes," said the royal disputant, "but none of these men raised their sword against their princes." "God," said the stout Reformer, "had not given them the power and the means." "Then, do you think," asked the queen, "that subjects having the power may resist their princes?" "If princes exceed their bounds," said the unflinching Knox, and proceeded to illustrate his argument by the case of a parent seized with frenzy and bound by his children.

At this bold and startling declaration the queen was struck dumb. She remained silent, and looked so ill, that her brother asked her if anything ailed her. After a little she recovered herself and said, "Well, then, I perceive that my subjects will obey you and not me." "God forbid," answered the Reformer, "that I take upon me to command any to obey me, or yet to set subjects at liberty to do whatsoever pleases them, but my travail is, that both princes and subjects obey God." After this he proceeded to say, that it became kings and queens to be nursing fathers and nursing mothers to the

Church. "Yes," quoth the queen, "but ye are not the Church that I will nourish. I will defend the Church of Rome, for I think it is the true Church of God." "Your will, madam," said Knox sternly, "is no reason, neither doth your thought make that Roman harlot the immaculate spouse of Jesus Christ." When the uncourtly controversialist offered to prove that Rome was a harlot, and that the princes of the earth had committed fornication with her, the queen quietly said, "My conscience says not so." "Conscience, madam," said Knox, "requires knowledge, and I fear that of right knowledge you have but little." "But," said she, "I have both heard and read." "So had the Jews that crucified Christ," retorted the preacher. "You interpret the Scriptures in one manner, and the Roman clergy in another," said the royal Mary, still preserving her temper, and resolved not to be beat: "whom shall I believe, and who shall be judge?" Knox replied that the Scriptures were their own best interpreters, and that the mass had no authority in Scripture at all. "You are over hard for me," said the queen," but if they were here whom I have heard, they would answer you." Knox declared how it would rejoice him to meet in controversy with the ablest Romanists in Europe, but that he knew by experience that they avoided all arguments but fire and sword. The interview had been long, the afternoon was come, dinner was announced, and the queen rose to depart. The Reformer appears to have been touched with a transient loyalty at leaving, for he said, "I pray God, madam, that you may be as blessed within the Commonwealth of Scotland as ever Deborah was in the Commonwealth of Israel."[1]

Very different views have been taken of this interview between the gray-headed Reformer and the girlish queen. We think it must be allowed by all that very few royal personages would have borne so much as Mary did; and very few men would have spoken so roughly in the presence of royalty as Knox did. Would the bravest man in England have dared so to speak in the presence of Elizabeth? But, at the same time, we think it will be generally conceded that they were wholesome truths which the Reformer uttered, however painful they may have been to hear. They contain the germs of our present political liberty resting on a limited monarchy. Knox was not formed by nature to be a courtier, but perhaps for that very reason he was better suited to be a religious

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

Reformer. He was another Baptist, more suited to preach repentance in the wilderness than to live in kings' houses. "I commend better the success of his doings and preachings," said Randolph to Cecil, "than the manner thereof."[1]

In the beginning of September the queen made her public entry into Edinburgh. The magistrates had determined to receive her with unusual magnificence; and we read in the Registers of the town council of new bonnets, new coats, and new hose—of coifs of black velvet and doublets of crimson satin ordered for their attendants, that they might join in the triumphal procession with becoming civic dignity. Pageants were also prepared in honour of the day, cunningly devised to show their Protestantism as well as their loyalty. The queen dined in the castle. When she came out, on her return to the palace, the first sight that met her eyes was a beautiful boy coming out of a round hole intended to represent heaven. The cherub presented to her Majesty a Bible, a psalter, and the keys of the city, and then recited some verses in her praise. Knox, with indignation, beheld her handing the Bible to Arthur Erskine, whom he denominates the most pestilent Papist in the kingdom. Proceeding a little further, she beheld Korah, Dathan, and Abiram swallowed up alive for having offered strange fire in their censers to the Lord. It was a significant representation of the fate of idolaters. But a more significant representation still was designed—a priest was to have been burned in the act of elevating the Host, but the Earl of Huntly had influence enough to prevent it.[2] Having run the gauntlet of these edifying spectacles, the queen reached her palace. Shall we believe that pleasure or vexation possessed her mind?

Notwithstanding these demonstrations of Protestant ardour, we have many indications that the queen was already softening the asperity which many had felt toward her because of her religion. The realm had long been without a sovereign, and though a few wished it to be without a sovereign still, the great majority of the nation were pleased that Holyrood was again tenanted. The beauty, the grace, the affable and winning manners of Mary, charmed all who were admitted

---

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 24th October 1561. Given in Keith, book ii. chap. ii.

[2] Randolph to Cecil, 7th September 1561. Given in Keith, book ii. chap. ii.; Knox's History, book iv.

into her presence. Furious Protestants felt their reforming zeal thawing rapidly under her smiles. As the Lords of the Congregation presented themselves one after another at court, they were at first inclined to fret because of the mass, but their indignation quickly subsided, and they became inclined to concede toleration to their queen. Lord Ochiltree had been long of making his appearance, but when at last he came, Campbell of Kinzeancleuch ventured to say to him: "My lord, now you are come, and almost the last of all the rest; and I perceive by your anger that the fire edge is not off you yet; but I fear that after the holy water of the court is sprinkled upon you, that you shall become as temperate as the rest; for I have been here now five days, and at the first I heard very many say, 'Let us hang the priest;' but after they had been twice or thrice in the abbey, all that fervency past. I think there is some enchantment by which men are bewitched."[1]

Within two months after her arrival, Mary felt herself strong enough to take a step in defence of her fellow-religionists. The magistrates of Edinburgh had published a proclamation commanding all priests, monks, friars, nuns, adulterers, fornicators, and other such filthy persons, to leave the city within eighteen hours, under pain of being publicly carted through the town and burned upon the cheek. The queen instantly issued a counter-proclamation, commanding the town council to meet and deprive the provost and bailies of their offices as the punishment of their presumption, and elect others in their room. The council succumbed, and did as they were ordered. "And so," writes Knox, "murderers, adulterers, thieves, whores, drunkards, idolaters, and all malefactors, got protection under the queen's wings."[2]

Dec. 1561.

When things were in this state a General Assembly of the Church was held. It was observed that the Protestant barons who had been sprinkled with the holy water of the court absented themselves. As important measures were contemplated, a committee was appointed to confer with them and effect a reconciliation. The nobles complained that the ministers had done things in secret without their knowledge. Angry words were exchanged, and Lethington went so far as to challenge the

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

[2] Keith's History, book ii. chap. ii. Knox's History, book iv.

right of the Assembly to meet without the sanction of the queen. "Take from us the freedom of assemblies," said Knox, "and take from us the gospel." The dispute was settled upon the understanding that the queen might send any one to the Assembly to hear what questions were discussed—the first step toward the appointment of a royal commissioner. An effort was now made to get her Majesty to ratify the "Book of Discipline." When the number of her council who had signed it was quoted—"How many of those who subscribed that book will be subject to it?" said a courtier? "All the godly," said a preacher. "Will the duke?" said Lethington. "If he will not," answered Lord Ochiltree, "I would that he were scraped out, not only of that book, but also out of our number and company." "Many subscribe there," retorted Lethington, "*in fide parentum*, as children are baptised." "Albeit you think that scoff proper," said John Knox fiercely; "yet as it is most untrue, so it is improper: that book was read in public audience on divers days, so that no man was required to subscribe what he understood not." "Stand content," said the baron; "that book will not be obtained." "Let God," replied the preacher, "require the lack and want which this poor commonwealth shall have of the things therein contained from the hands of such as stop the same."[1] It was the disposal of the ecclesiastical temporalities, provided for in the "Book of Discipline," which mainly stood in the way of its ratification.

But it was evident that something must be done to keep the Protestant preachers from positive starvation. Hitherto they had depended almost entirely upon the benevolence of their congregations; many of them were in abject poverty; and they were clamorous against the government, as hungry men always are. Meanwhile the rich benefices of the Church were still held by the Romish ecclesiastics, or enjoyed by the nobles who had violently seized upon them. In these circumstances, the Privy Council conceived the idea of allowing the old clergy to retain two-thirds of their benefices during their life-time, and of appropriating the remaining third partly for the ministry and partly for the crown. An order was therefore issued, requiring all the beneficed clergy in the kingdom to produce their rent-rolls, that the value of the ecclesiastical property might thus be ascertained; and the superintendents were at the same time re-

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

quired to make up lists of the ministers, exhorters, and readers of the Protestant Church, that calculations might be made as to how much would be required for their support.[1]

They were Protestant nobles who sat in council when this scheme was devised, most of them the men who had been the Lords of the Congregation. Their legislation when in power was certainly different from their sentiments when in opposition. Their scheme appears marvellous for two reasons—their own entire disinterestedness, and their great generosity to the Romish clergy. They are silent in regard to their own claims: they are careful of the rights of the ousted ecclesiastics. It was certainly but just that these, though now prevented from executing their functions, should have a proportion of their ancient property, and it would have been a sin and a shame to have thrown them as beggars on the world; but it was scarcely to be expected that such an appreciation of "the just" should have been found in such men and in such an age. It was seldom then that the vanquished were spared. Courtly and Catholic influences had probably something to do with the arrangements; but it will shortly be seen that the nobles, by being generous to the priesthood, were enabled to be generous to themselves. The Archbishop of St Andrews, and the Bishops of Moray, Ross, and Dunkeld, were present, and gave their consent when the resolution was formed; and when they were taking their leave, the Earl of Huntly jocosely said to them, "Good-morrow, my lords of the two parts."[2]

Knox disliked the scheme from the first, and spoke vehemently against it. "Well," said he, "if the end of this order, pretended to be taken for the sustentation of the ministry, be happy, my judgment fails me; for first I see two parts freely given to the devil, and the third must be divided between God and the devil." He prophesied that it would be seen that the devil would get three parts of the third, and then, cried he, "you may judge what God's portion will be." The courtiers, on the other hand, accused the clergy of greed; and the secretary Lethington, in his sneering way, said, that if the ministers got their will, "the queen would not have enough to buy herself a pair of new shoes."[3]

When the rent-rolls of all the clergy had been produced, as they were after considerable hesitation and delay, it was found

---

[1] Knox's History, Keith's History, &c., &c.

[2] Knox's History, book iv.

[3] Ibid.

that the thirds of all the benefices in the kingdom amounted to £72,491.[1] This was a large sum, and might have gone a long way in maintaining an established church. The next step to be taken was to modify stipends to the several superintendents, ministers, exhorters, and readers. The Earls of Argyll and Morton, the Lord James, now Earl of Moray, the Laird of Lethington, the Justice-Clerk, and the Clerk-Register, were appointed for the purpose, and the Laird of Pitarrow was appointed their comptroller. The preachers could not have desired a better commission: they were all Protestants. Nevertheless they proved parsimonious, and out of the £72,491 assigned only £24,231[2] to the Reformed Church. The Revenue of the Romish Church must have amounted to upwards of £250,000.[3] "Who would have thought," says Knox, "that when Joseph ruled Egypt, his brethren should have travelled for victuals, and have returned with empty sacks?"[4] The modificators appear to have been resolved that the new race of ecclesiastics should not wax wanton through too much affluence, and so they assigned to them stipends ranging from 100 to 300 merks.[5] The ministers cried out against their stinted stipends, which, small as they were, were but ill paid; and in many cases they must have been absolutely in want. "The Laird of Pitarrow," says Knox, "was an earnest professor; but the great devil receive the

---

[1] Several small benefices were at first omitted, and which, when afterwards added, increased this by £1389, 10s.

[2] Appendix to Keith's History. Besides this sum, there was also a small allowance to Knox and the superintendents. Keith has, with great industry, collected the revenues of our ancient bishoprics and religious houses.

[3] I make up this sum by multiplying £72,491+£1389 by 3, and then making some allowance for the under-valuation put upon their revenues by the Romish ecclesiastics. The valuation was notoriously too low.

[4] History, book iv.

[5] Considerable misapprehension exists in regard to the stipends of the first Protestant ministers in our country, and many imagine them to have been much lower than they really were. The money referred to is Scotch money. £1 Scotch is equal only to 1s. 8d. sterling; and as the merk is two-thirds of a pound, its proportionate value is only 1s. 1⅓d. Hence 100 merks amount to £5, 11s. 1⅓d., 300 to £16, 13s. 4d. sterling. From this it might be concluded, and has been concluded, that the stipends of the Scottish clergy vibrated between these two sums. But it must be taken into account that the £1 Scotch at that time was at least as valuable as the £1 sterling now, as it would buy as much, if not more; and therefore, again, taking the merk as two-thirds of a pound, we shall state the case more truly if we say that the stipends varied from £70 to £200. The

comptroller." The grumbling of the clergy did little good. They were simply told they must rest satisfied, that many lairds had not so much, and that the queen could not spare more. "Oh happy servants of the devil," said our Reformer, with keen irony, "and miserable servants of Jesus Christ, if after this life there were no heaven and no hell; for to the servants of the devil, these dumb dogs and horrid bishops, to one of these idle bellies ten thousand was not enough; but to the servants of Christ, that painfully preach the gospel, a hundred will suffice."

When the stipends of the ministers were paid, there still remained upwards of £48,000, which, according to the scheme of the Council, ought to have been annexed to the Crown, to maintain its splendour. Royalty in Scotland for long had possessed but small revenues, and it must be acknowledged that it had some claims upon the ecclesiastical property of the country, as it had come to poverty by the ancient alienation of its demesnes to the Church. But royalty was in reality little enriched. We find, indeed, in the accounts, £9000 expended upon the queen's body-guard, £303 in the purchase of their uniforms, and £75 paid to David Rizzio, valet of the chamber. The remanent thousands were swallowed up otherwise. There were numerous pensions to courtiers and their kin. There were numerous remittances of the thirds. The

---

average price of grain, as we learn from the Book of Assignations and the Book of Assumptions, appears to have been about 20 merks per chalder; so that, converting the money into victual, we might say that the stipends ranged from five to fifteen chalders.

If we compare these stipends with the value of many of the ancient benefices, we shall find them higher rather than lower. In 1561 the rectory of Kilmaronock was let for 100 merks (Book of Assumptions). The benefice of Eddleston was rated at £133, 6s. 8d. (Libellus Taxationum). Newlands was let for 200 merks (Book of Assumptions). The parsonage of Buchanan was valued at £40. The vicarage of Bonhill was under £7. The parsonage and vicarage of Killearn were set together in 1561 for 160 merks. The rectory of Carmunnock amounted to £20, the vicarage to £6, 13s. 4d. The rectory and vicarage of Neilston were let at the time of the Reformation for £66, 13s. 4d., &c. These are taken at random, and form a sample of the whole. With these the stipends of the Protestant clergy will stand a comparison, as we find them stated in the "Register of Ministers and their Stipend sen the year 1567." The minister of Ratho has £100, St Cuthbert's £200, Perth £200 and a chalder of oats, Glasgow £240, Kinfauns 100 merks, Kilgour 40 merks. The reader at Comrie has 20 merks, at Cargill £20, at Arngask £16, &c. The Register of Ministers and Readers in 1574, published in the Miscellany of the Wodrow Society, shows similar results.

Earl of Moray drew the large revenues of the Priories of St Andrews and Pittenweem without deduction. Many others did the like. The Earl of Argyll, the Lord Erskine, and a host of others, divided the spoil, and little was left to the queen herself. There are two entries in the accounts which we read with sympathy. The one is £1018 given to a multitude of houseless monks, and the other is £754, 3s. 11d. given to a number of enfranchised nuns.[1] Shall we blame the charity which helped them in their distress?

Before leaving this subject it will be well to trace the fortunes of the property which still remained in the hands of the beneficed clergy. We have already had some indications of the course it was to take. We have quoted Acts of Assembly and Acts of Council, levelled at Churchmen feuing their manses, lands, and tithes. Here was the device. When the Romish clergy saw that all chance of preserving the Church was gone, they began to give feus and long leases of their property to their relatives and friends among the nobility and gentry; and these gladly accepted, if indeed they had not arranged, the advantageous offers thus made to them, hoping they would have sufficient influence to get them afterwards confirmed, and made perpetual in their families. To ease the consciences of the Roman donors, perhaps also to ease the consciences of the Protestant receivers, and to give an appearance of validity to the transactions, the confirmation of the Pope was asked; and, in a multitude of cases, the confirmation of the Pope was obtained. A bribe silenced all scruples. When Churchmen were unwilling thus to alienate the Church's patrimony, fraud or force was sometimes employed to secure compliance. The Earl of Cassillis had cast covetous eyes upon the Abbacy of Glenluce, and was in treaty with the abbot for its feu; but before the bargain was concluded the abbot died. The Earl was not to be baulked; and therefore he bribed a monk to forge the necessary documents; and then he employed a retainer to stab the monk, lest he should reveal the forgery; and, last of all, he made his uncle hang the retainer, lest he should let out the murder. The same nobleman had farther desired the Abbacy of Crossraguel, and, shortly after the Reformation, had got a feu of it from the abbot. But this abbot died, and another was appointed; and as the earl's feu had not received the royal confirmation, the new abbot held it as null. The earl decoyed him to his

---

[1] Keith's History, Appendix.

castle of Dunmure, and roasted him over a slow fire, till, in the extremity of his torture, he consented to sign papers ratifying the earl's rights, with a hand ill able to hold the pen. The abbot afterwards brought his complaint before the Council; but Cassillis was too powerful to be punished; and peace was ultimately made by a small pension paid by the tormentor to his victim, whom he had rendered decrepit for life.[1]

When a member of the hierarchy died, the office was not allowed to remain vacant. A successor was generally appointed, not indeed to discharge the functions, but to draw the revenues of the place. The Church had long ago given the hint of this by the appointment of commendators. These new bishops and abbots were generally Protestants, frequently laymen, sometimes boys. They were appointed for a purpose; and the terms of their appointment sometimes indicated what the purpose was. On the death of Bishop Sinclair, a young lad, named Alexander Campbell, of the family of Ardkinlas, was presented to the Bishopric of Brechin, and his presentation expressly gave him power "to dispone and alienate the benefices, as well of the spirituality as temporality of the bishoprick." The youth availed himself of his power, and alienated a great part of the lands and tithes of his See to his patron, the Earl of Argyll, who had probably obtained the grant for him, and was thus repaid for his services.[2] It is remarkable that men should have preferred these flimsy pretexts of law to open robbery. It was esteemed the more decent way to get possession of the Church's property—it had the colour of right.

But in other cases the Church's lands and revenues passed into lay hands by a more direct road. A large proportion of the dignified clergy, especially of the abbots and priors, joined the Reformers; and when the Reformation was completed, some of these were rewarded by getting their abbacies erected into temporal lordships. The holy fathers were now free to marry; and the property which they originally held only for life became perpetual in their families, free from the burden of discharging monastic duties, and feeding monks who did nothing but eat.[3] In instances still more numerous, abbacies

---

[1] Historical and Genealogical Account of the Principal Families of the name of Kennedy, from an Original MS., Bannatyne Club.

[2] Keith's History, book ii.

[3] It was seriously contemplated, at one time, to make the holders of abbacies pay to the crown a sum equal to what would have been re-

were bestowed upon favourite courtiers or powerful barons; the lands frequently carried a title of nobility along with them; the new possessor was a lord of parliament, and enjoyed all the honours, privileges, and powers which his monkish ancestors had enjoyed before him. Under these different dissolving processes, the patrimony of the Church gradually melted away; and the Protestant clergy were too helpless to come in for any considerable share when they divided the spoil with the strong.

The majority of the superior clergy of the Roman communion lost but little by the Reformation. Many gained prodigiously. They all had the two-thirds of their benefices secured to them; they increased these by their feus; and many had lands and tithes, which were theirs only for life, bestowed upon themselves and their heirs for ever. But it was very different with the inferior clergy. As a general rule they were reduced to absolute beggary. An act of the first Assembly provides that they should receive alms like other poor, if their conversation was honest. The queen, with true kind-heartedness, bestows nearly £2000 out of her proportion of the thirds upon destitute monks and nuns. In the "Book of Assumptions" we find frequent references to small sums retained for the helpless, houseless wretches, now they were turned adrift. In the Cistercian Abbey of Melrose, eleven monks and three portioners have twenty merks, and a small quantity of victual assigned to each of them. In the Cistercian Nunnery of North Berwick, eleven nuns are pensioned with £20 each. In the Abbey of Newbattle, six aged and decrepit monks, who had recanted, are liberally pensioned with £240. In the monastery of Culross, of nine monks, five embraced reform, and had an allowance granted to them, but the other four would not listen to reason, and so they were left to starve. Many of the clergy

quired for the sustenance of the usual number of monks. "Before this tyme a litill, thair was a plat devysit for the benefite of the prence, as was pretendit; to wit, that as in all abbacies thair was a number of monks that was sustenit upon thair awin severall portions, that prejugeit not the abbot's rent; and that the abbot, after the death of ilk monk, had appropriate the portion to his awin behuve, whereas, be the first institution, still another sould have bene surrogat to the place; therefore it was devysit to call in all abbots and uthers prelates that war presidents of convents to a compt, to caus thayme to bestow upon the king, for all tyme bygane, the portions of the monks departit before that day, and sielyke for all tyme cuming." (Historie of King James Sext, p. 233, Ban. Ed.)

thus reduced to want became proselytes for a morsel of bread, and received employment in the Protestant Church.[1]

Meanwhile the Reformation was making rapid progress toward the occupation of the land. We can distinctly trace its history in the records of the Assemblies. Yet it were a waste of time, and an abuse of patience, to go over the proceedings of Assembly after Assembly; and the purpose of our history will better be served by giving a general view of the business which came under the notice of these venerable courts, and of the manner in which it was transacted. Every Protestant nobleman would seem to have been invited to sit in the first Assemblies, and many of these were generally present, as the sederunts show. In 1567 we find missives directed to a large number of lords, barons, and other brethren, requiring them to compear at an Assembly, which is described in the body of the missive as a General Assembly of the whole professors of all estates and degrees within the Kirk of Scotland.[2] In the very next year, however, we find it resolved, that none should have place or power to vote in the Assembly except superintendents, commissioners appointed for visiting kirks, ministers brought with them, and presented as able to reason and judge, commissioners of burghs and shires, together with the commissioners of universities. The Assembly at this period met twice in the year, in June and December, and in December it generally began its sittings upon the 25th, to show its contempt for the Romish festival of Christmas. At first no Moderator was chosen, so primitive was the manner in which business was done, but in the sixth General Assembly John Willock was chosen to this honour, to prevent confusion in the debates.[3]

Much time in all the first Assemblies was occupied in the appointment of ministers, exhorters, and readers; and it is amazing how rapidly the vacant parishes were supplied. In several cases we have modest men declaring themselves unfit for the office of the ministry, but compelled to take it under

---

[1] The superintendent of Angus and Mearns was accused of having admitted many immoral and ignorant Popish priests as readers. (Records of Assembly.)

[2] This was the Assembly held at the time when Mary was in the hands of the lords who had risen against the government, and when they were yet unresolved what to do. A large attendance of noblemen was desired, that the affairs of the kingdom, as well as of the Church, might be decided in the Assembly. (Keith's Hist. book iii.)

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 17.

the pain of the censures of the Church. In other cases we have presumptuous men removed from offices which they had taken upon themselves. In every Assembly, ministers, exhorters, and readers joined in complaints that their stipends were small and irregularly paid, and in some instances they excused themselves for not having done the work which was imposed upon them from their inability to bear the expense it would have entailed.[1] These complaints were generally followed by resolutions to petition the Secret Council, to prevent the further alienation of the Church's lands. But one of the most characteristic features of these Assemblies was delating the superintendents. These dignified Presbyterian Churchmen were removed from the house one after another, and the clergy of their diocese invited to make complaints against them, and there appears to have been no disinclination to do so. The superintendent of Fife was blamed for being too much given to worldly affairs, slack in preaching, rash in excommunicating, sharper than became him in exacting payment of small tithes. The superintendent of Angus was accused of having admitted too many illiterate and immoral Popish priests to be readers in his diocese, of having rashly admitted some young men to the ministry without the forms prescribed in the "Book of Discipline;" of having chosen gentlemen of vicious lives to be elders; of tolerating ministers who did not visit the sick, nor instruct the youth; and who on the Sundays came to their churches long after the hour, and departed again the moment the sermon was done.[2] The superintendent of the West was charged with being slack in the extirpation of idolatry; but he pleaded that he was hindered in the good work by the Duke and the Earl of Cassillis.[3] When the superintendents had one by one passed through this fiery ordeal, the ministers required to walk over the same course; and as it had been the duty of the ministers to rake up everything they could against the superintendents, so now it was the privilege of the superintendents to mete out to them the same measure they had meted to others.

The other business of these Assemblies was very miscellaneous. The sacraments were ordered to be administered

---

[1] The universal complaint, we are told, was, that kirks lacked ministers, and ministers lacked stipends. (Assembly vi. Keith, book iii. chap. iii.)

[2] Fifth General Assembly. Keith, book iii. chap. iii.

[3] Seventh General Assembly. Keith, book iii. chap. iii.

according to the forms of the Book of Geneva.[1] Every minister was ordered to furnish himself with a copy of the Psalm-Book, which had just been printed with the Order of Geneva attached to it.[2] The minister of Galston complained that his wife had abandoned him and fled to England, whereupon letters were directed to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, requesting edicts to be proclaimed or citations executed against the fugitive lady.[3] Four women were accused of witchcraft, and were handed over to the Privy Council.[4] John Knox asks leave to go to England to visit his children, and is furnished with letters of commendation.[5] The confession of the Helvetian churches is approved of, with the exception of the appointment of festival days.[6] Complaints are made against the Archbishop of St Andrews being again invested with his ancient jurisdiction in testamentary and other matters. A letter is written to the bishops and clergy of England, begging them in the bowels of Jesus Christ to bear with those of their brethren whose consciences would not allow them to wear any religious apparel, seeing that surplices, cornets, capes, and tippets were but vain trifles.[7]

While the Assemblies were thus legislating, complaining, petitioning, and writing pastoral epistles, the public mind was in a state of tremulous excitement. There were still abundant sources of irritation. The ancient Church was not clean swept away. It stood like the bare and blackened walls of a building which had been gutted by fire. Romish ecclesiastics lived in the manses, cultivated the glebes, lifted the tithes, sat in the senate, presided on the bench.[8] Protestant preachers occupied the churches, expounded the Scriptures, and dispensed the sacraments to the people. The rapidity with which the Catholic worship had been overthrown was marvellous, but we must not imagine that the overthrow was complete. The mass was still celebrated in many parish churches, and where it could not be celebrated openly in the

---

[1] Fourth General Assembly. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 13. Keith places this act in the Fifth Assembly.

[2] Ninth Gen. Assembly. Keith. [3] Seventh Gen. Assembly. Keith.

[4] Seventh Gen. Assembly. Keith. [5] Thirteenth Gen. Assembly. Keith.

[6] Twelfth Gen. Assembly. Keith. [7] Thirteenth Gen. Assembly. Keith.

[8] "For sa muckle as it was heavilie lamentit be the maist part of the ministers that they can have no dwelling-places at their kirks because the manses ar either deteinit be the parsons or vicars of the samen, or else sett in feu or utherwayes to gentlemen." (General Assembly, iv. sess. 5. Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 13.)

churches, it was performed privately in gentlemen's houses. Large districts were still attached to the ancient forms. When Protestant ministers made their appearance at Paisley, Aberdeen, Curry, Duplin, Aberdalgie, they found the doors of the churches barred against them.[1] Quentin Kennedy, Abbot of Crossraguel, and Ninian Wingate, schoolmaster of Linlithgow, threw down the gauntlet, and challenged Knox to discussion.[2] The people nowhere could shake off their early prejudices, and, notwithstanding their Protestantism, persisted in going on pilgrimage to chapels and wells, and keeping wakes for the dead.[3] When such strong counter-currents meet, a violent commotion is the necessary result. Society in Scotland was in as troubled a state as it well could be. The agitation was increased by political events, to which we must now refer.

Since her first arrival in the kingdom, the young queen had thrown herself entirely upon the friendship and support of her Protestant subjects. Maitland of Lethington was made her secretary. Her principal advisers were Reformers. Her brother the Lord James was constantly at her side, and in fact held in his hand the sceptre, while she was content to wear the crown. He was created Earl of Mar, and afterwards Earl of Moray, an honour which he had long coveted. Her face was turned away from her fellow-religionists, though she must in her heart have sympathised with them. The potent Earl of Huntly, still a Catholic, was treated coldly, driven into rebellion, defeated, and slain. His second son died on the scaffold, and his immense estates were forfeited. But as the queen still continued a Romanist herself, and insisted upon the private use of the mass, she was suspected and disliked by the more vehement Reformers. Nothing but the unconditional surrender of her religion would satisfy them. The queen, moreover, was fond of gaiety—the dance and the

---

[1] In the Ninth General Assembly the Church "requyres punishment of sick as hes steikit the doores of the paroch kirks, and will not opin the samen to preachers that have presentit themselves to preach the Word, sick as Paisley, Aberdeen, Curry, Duplin, and Aberdalgie." See also Lee's Paisley Abbey.

[2] "Ane Compendius Tractive," published by Kennedy in 1558, is reprinted in the Wodrow Miscellany, with Davidson's answer to it. Wingate's Controversial Tracts are to be found in the Appendix to Keith. They have also been published, with a prefatory notice, by the Maitland Club. Wingate was glad to flee to the Continent, where he became abbot of a Scotch monastery at Ratisbone.

[3] We have Acts of Assembly against these practices.

song, to which she had been accustomed in joyous France. The preachers were scandalised at this, and it must be confessed that many of the dances of that day were grossly indecent, and in some respects as lewdly suggestive as the modern Parisian quadrilles. But a dance might be indicative of political triumph as well as of libidinous desire. News had arrived that peace had been restored to France; and, conjoined with this, there were rumours that the Guises were about to commence a persecution of the Huguenots. About the same time a ball was given at Holyrood, and the dancing was kept up with great spirit till after midnight. Knox heard of this, and on the following Sunday he chose for his text, "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed, ye judges of the earth," and from these words declaimed against persecuting and dancing princes.[1]

Some of the queen's attendants reported this to her Majesty, and Knox was summoned into her presence. The Reformer told the queen that it had been better she had come and heard the sermon herself than have listened to distorted reports of it from others. "I doubt not," said he, "but that it came to the ears of Herod that our Master Jesus Christ called him a fox; but they told him not how odious a thing it was before God to murder an innocent, as he had lately done before, causing to behead John the Baptist, to reward the dancing of a harlot's daughter." He then proceeded to state what he had really said in his sermon. He had declared "that violence and oppression occupied the throne of God upon earth; that murderers and bloodthirsty men presented themselves before kings and princes, while the poor saints were exiled; that princes were more exercised in fiddling and flinging, than in reading and hearing God's most blessed Word; and that fiddlers and flatterers were more precious in their eyes than men of wisdom and gravity. As for dancing," he remarked, "though he found it nowhere praised in God's Word, and though he thought it fitter for the mad than the sane, yet he did not utterly condemn it if it did not interfere with more serious concerns, and if it were not used to triumph over God's people." This was bad enough, but it would appear that the reports were worse. The queen said so, and told the stern censor, that if at any time he had any fault to find with her, she would much rather he would come and tell it to

---

[1] Randolph wrote to Kyllygrew regarding the court ladies that they were merry, lopping, dancing, lusty, and fair. (Eliz., vol. vii. No. 93 a).

herself. This was kindly said, and no doubt kindly meant; but Knox rudely answered that he had something else to do "than come and wait at her chamber door, and whisper in her Majesty's ear." The queen turned her back upon him. As he left the palace, men were watching the expression of his countenance, and he overheard one whisper, "He is not afraid." "Why should the pleasant face of a lady affray me?" said the unmoved man. "I have looked in the faces of many angry men, and have not been afraid above measure."[1]

It is from Knox himself we get the account of these scenes at the palace, and it is probable he makes himself ruder in writing than he actually was in the royal presence. Of his outspokenness there can be no doubt. But there was need for it, and all the more because Mary was a beautiful woman. If he spoke sharply, he did not give way to mere random invective: he knew what he was saying. He had penetrated as deeply into the political designs of the day as any man living, and had probably sources of information through the French Huguenots. The State papers, which were then seen by only a few eyes, but which are now published to the world, make it plain that this woman, able as she was beautiful, was bent upon the restoration of the Catholic religion, and that she was plotting not only with her cousins of Guise, but with a more dangerous and formidable man, Philip of Spain, the greatest bigot and bloodiest persecutor of the time.

There were penal statutes against the mass, but they had seldom been put into execution. Perhaps the queen denied their validity, as she had never ratified the proceedings of the parliament which passed them; perhaps she felt it would be indecent for her to punish others for what she did herself. But the more vehement Reformers were resolved that these sanguinary laws should not lie idle in the statute-book, and therefore the westland gentlemen, in their character of magistrates, laid hold of some of the perverse priests, and warned others, especially the Abbot of Crossraguel and the parson of Sanquhar, that they would do well to desist from saying mass. The queen was then at Lochleven, enjoying herself amid its pleasant scenery, and little dreaming it was soon to be her prison, when intelligence of this reached her. Knowing the influence of Knox with his party, she resolved to send for him, and try the influence of persuasion. Knox came, and was admitted to an audience.

May 1563.

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

The queen complained that her subjects had taken the law into their own hand, and that it was hard that men should be punished for worshipping their God according to their conscience. "The sword of justice, madam, is God's," said the Reformer, "and is given to princes and rulers for one end, which, if they transgress, sparing the wicked and oppressing the innocent, they that in the fear of God execute judgment where God hath commanded offend not God; neither-yet sin they that bridle kings from striking innocent men in their rage. The examples are evident, for Samuel spared not to slay Agag, the fat and delicate King of Amalek, whom King Saul had saved; neither spared Elias Jezebel's false prophets and Baal's priests, albeit King Ahab was present; Phinehas was no magistrate, and yet feared he not to strike Zimri and Cosbi in the very act of filthy fornication. And so, madam, you Majesty may see that others than chief magistrates may lawfully punish, and have punished the vices and crimes which God commands to be punished; for power by act of parliament is given to all judges to search the mass-mongers, or hearers of the same, and to punish them according to the law."[1] Knox may have been right in holding that magistrates were entitled to put existing laws into execution; but he was plainly wrong in the applicability of the Old Testament examples which he cited, or every bigot would be entitled to commit murder when he pleased, and then quote the examples of Samuel, Elijah, and Phinehas. The queen bore with him with wonderful patience, continued the conversation for two hours, and only broke it off when supper-time had come. Knox left her presence to go and repeat all that had passed to the Earl of Moray.

Before sunrise the next morning, Knox was again summoned to wait upon her Majesty. She had gone out to enjoy a day's hawking, and Knox came up with her in the fields near Kinross. She received him with the greatest kindness and condescension; told him of a little love affair between Lord Ruthven and herself; warned him against the Bishop of Galloway, whom she knew to be a dangerous man; confided to him some domestic differences between the Earl and Countess of Argyll, and begged his good offices to effect a reconciliation; and finally, before parting, said to him, with reference to their interview on the previous evening, that she would cause all offenders against the laws to be summoned, and see justice done. She kept her word: so soon as she returned to

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

Edinburgh, the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Prior of Whithorn, and several others, were brought before the Council, and committed to custody. Was not this enough to make Knox relent? But he did not. Mary was a Papist, and a Papist was an abomination in his sight.

June 4, 1563. On the 4th of June 1563 the parliament assembled. The queen rode in state to the Tolbooth, and delivered the opening address, surrounded by a crowd of ladies, whom French milliners had made more than usually gay. "Such stinking pride of women," says Knox, "as was seen at that parliament, was never seen before in Scotland." But there were others felt differently, and while the queen spoke, there were heard whispers among the audience—"God save that sweet face; was there ever orator spake so properly and so sweetly?"[1] The more vehement of the Reformers wished to obtain in this parliament a ratification of the treaty of Leith; but Moray and Lethington, knowing the queen's aversion to this, had resolved to content themselves with an act of indemnity. Knox and Moray had a violent altercation on the subject, which ended in a quarrel, and for eighteen months the two chiefs of the Reformation scarcely exchanged words. The act of indemnity was passed; and to conciliate the clergy, acts were also passed to punish adulterers and witches with death; to repair the parish churches; to prevent the letting of manses and glebes by the Romish occupants, and ultimately secure them to the Protestant ministry. The preachers were clamorous for a law against the superfluity of female attire, which they affirmed was sure to bring God's vengeance not only upon the foolish women themselves, but upon the whole kingdom;[2] but the love neither of religion nor economy could induce the lords to intermeddle with the ruffs and farthingales of their ladies.

If the press be a fourth estate of the realm now, the pulpit arrogated this honour and authority to itself at the time of the Reformation. While the parliament was sitting, St Gile's was crowded with courtiers and legislators. Undivided by partitions, and unencumbered with galleries, it then opened up its long nave and aisles to the echoing voice of the preacher. John Knox, mounting the pulpit, believed himself in the place "where God required him to speak the truth, and therefore speak it he would, impugn it whoso listed." He drew a picture of the dangers through which the nation had passed; of the struggle the Reformers had endured. "In your most

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

[2] Ibid.

extreme danger," he exclaimed, "I have been with you; St Johnstone, Cupar-moor, and the charges of Edinburgh are yet recent in my heart; yea, that dark and dolorous night wherein all you, my Lords, with shame and fear left this town, is yet in my mind; and God forbid that ever I forget it." He alluded to speeches which had been made by some to the effect that the Protestant religion had never been established by law, and declared that those who spoke such things deserved to be hanged upon a gallows. He adverted to the rumours which were in circulation in regard to the marriage of the queen with the Infant of Spain, and said that if the nobles consented to her marrying a Papist, they would banish Jesus Christ from the realm, and bring God's judgments upon the country and themselves.[1] All this was uttered as Knox could utter his fierce philippics, with a voice low and calm at first, but soon rising into a perfect hurricane.

Rumours of this soon reached the palace, and again the preacher was summoned into the presence of the queen. Knox found Mary in a violent fit of grief and rage. "I have borne with you," she exclaimed, "in all your rigorous manner of speaking, both against myself and my uncles; I have even sought your favour by all possible means; I offered you presence and audience whenever you pleased to admonish me; and yet I cannot be quit of you. I vow to God I shall be revenged;" and so saying she burst into tears. Knox was unmoved; he could even afterwards mock at her grief. "Scarce could her page," says he, "get handkerchiefs to hold her eyes dry; for the tears and the howling, besides womanly weeping, staid her speech." When the fit of crying had subsided, Knox remarked, "that when it should please God to deliver her Majesty from the bondage of error in which she had been nourished, she would not find the liberty of his tongue to be offensive; and that in the pulpit it was his duty to speak plain, and flatter no flesh." "But what," cried she passionately, "have you to do with my marriage?" for her heart was set upon the Spanish match, and it was all but arranged. In answer to this Knox said, "that he must preach repentance, which implied the noting of particular sins;" and "it so happens," said he, "that the most part of the nobility are so devoted to your wishes, that neither God's Word nor yet the commonwealth are rightly regarded; and therefore it

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv. There was the same agitation in England ten years earlier in regard to the marriage of Mary with Philip of Spain. (See Froude, vol. vi.)

becometh me to speak, that they may know their duty." "But what have you to do with my marriage," she again asked, "or what are you within the commonwealth?" "A subject born within the same," said Knox, proudly; "and albeit I be neither earl, lord, nor baron, yet hath God made me a profitable and useful member." "My vocation craves," he continued, "plainness of speech, and therefore, madam, I say to yourself what I have spoken in public, that whenever the nobility shall consent to your marrying an unlawful husband, they will do as much as in them lies to renounce Christ, banish truth, betray the freedom of the realm, and bring discomfort upon yourself." Upon this the queen again gave way to a passionate fit of crying. Erskine of Dun had accompanied John Knox into the queen's presence, and now did everything he could to soothe and comfort her; but "the said John," to quote his own description of the scene, "stood still, without any alteration of countenance." At length he said that he did not delight in the weeping of any of God's creatures; that it grieved him to hear his own children cry when he whipped them; but that still he must speak the truth. This species of sympathy only increased the anger of the queen, and so the unflinching Reformer was ordered to leave her presence, and wait her pleasure in an adjoining room.

When Knox came into the outer apartment the courtiers carefully avoided him—Lord Ochiltree alone came and spoke to him. But he found himself in the midst of the ladies of the court, gorgeously apparelled, and probably busy at their tapestry. "Fair ladies," said he, with a smile on his face, "how pleasant were this life of yours if it should ever abide; and then in the end that we might pass to heaven with this gay gear. But fie upon that knave death, that will come whether we will or not; and when he hath laid on the arrest, then foul worms will be busy with this flesh, be it never so fair and so tender; and the silly soul, I fear, shall be so feeble, that it can neither carry with it gold, garnishing, targating, pearl, nor precious stones."[1] With such moralisings, which remind us of Hamlet, he entertained the maids of honour for a long hour, till the Laird of Dun came and told him he might go home. Perhaps as he made his way up the Canongate he thought, "better that women weep than bearded men," and so justified himself.

In the autumn of this year, the queen paid a visit to the western counties. During her absence from the capital, her

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

household, as usual, attended mass in the chapel on the Sunday. On that day the sacrament of the Supper was administered in St Gile's; and the solemn services had unhappily awakened religious rancour rather than Christian charity. A crowd of citizens gathered around the palace; some of them entered the chapel, and interrupted the service. A riot was apprehended; the magistrates were called upon to interfere; and two of the ringleaders were seized and committed for trial. Knox believed that the Protestant religion would be compromised if these two men were punished; and so he wrote circular letters to the leading Reformers in different parts of the country, requesting their presence in Edinburgh on the day of the trial. The Protestant gathering was no doubt designed to overawe the judges. It was a plan which had frequently succeeded during the Reformation struggle. It was a plan which feudal barons well knew; and in feudal times magistrates were often required to pronounce sentence in a court crowded with the armed retainers of the accused. A copy of Knox's circular came into the hands of the queen, and was pronounced to be treasonable. He was summoned before the council, to answer to the charge of having convocated the queen's lieges. Mary herself sat at the head of the council-table, hardly able to conceal her satisfaction at having now got her arch-enemy within her power. Knox stood at the foot of it, with his head uncovered. Lethington exerted all his ingenuity to get a verdict of guilty. The accused, when requested to answer for himself, drew a distinction between lawful and unlawful convocations; some of his friends in the council, anxious to save him, caught it up; and he was almost unanimously acquitted, to the queen's great chagrin. "That night," said the triumphant Knox, "there was neither dancing nor fiddling in the court, for our sovereign was disappointed of her purpose."[1] But though he was acquitted of treason, the more moderate Reformers blamed his violence, and few attempted altogether to justify his conduct.

During the year 1564, the great subject of conversation and anxiety in Scotland was the marriage of the queen. Gossips talked of it over their bread and ale; and diplomatists, ambassadors, and ministers of state discussed it in cabinets. It was known that the King of Sweden, the Infant of Spain, and the second son of the Emperor, had offered her their royal hearts and hands. But Mary, who had ever an eye on the English

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

throne, was anxious to consult the wishes of Elizabeth; and Elizabeth was averse to her forming an alliance with a foreign potentate. It was known that if she could have had her own way she would have preferred the Prince of Spain to any other match; but both Elizabeth and her own subjects were utterly opposed to her marrying a Papist. The Queen of England, not yet too old to love, suggested her own gallant, the Earl of Leicester; but her royal cousin justly suspected her sincerity, and more justly still considered the match as unbecoming her sovereign dignity. Mary had now been a widow for nearly three years, and was most anxious to marry again; but Elizabeth's intrigues threw such continual obstacles in her way, that she was outstripped in the matrimonial race by a competitor whom we could scarcely have expected to have found in such a contest. This was John Knox. He also had passed three years in widowhood, and was now verging upon the venerable age of sixty. He was an austere man; and to have seen him stern and unmoved in the presence of the weeping Mary, one would have thought him incapable of being influenced either by a woman's hate or a woman's love. But he must have had his softer moods; for the rough old man wooed and won Margaret Stewart, a daughter of Lord Ochiltree's, a young lady just escaping from her teens. Many thought the thing so extraordinary that they ascribed the girl's passion to witchcraft; but it is certain that the parents, as well as the bride, were delighted with the match.[1] For a time people ceased to speculate about Mary's marriage to talk of Knox's wedding.

But the veteran bridegroom took home his bride, the tittle-tattle died away, and again the subject of discourse was the future husband of the queen. In the month of February 1565,

---

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox, period vii. Dr M'Crie, in his appendix, has a curious note about Knox's courtship, taken from Nicol Burne's Disputation. He is said to have first asked the eldest daughter of the Duke of Chastelherault, and was refused; and then he set his heart npon Lord Ochiltree's daughter. "Rydand thair with ane gret court, on ane trim gelding, nocht lyk ane prophet or ane auld decrepit priest, as he was, bot lyk as he had bene ane of the blude royal, with his bendes of taffetie feschnit with golden ringis and precious stanes; and as is plainlie reportit in the countrey, be sorcerie and witchcraft did sua allure that puir gentil woman that scho could not leve without him; whilk apperis to be of greit probabilitie, scho being ane damsel of nobil blude, and he ane auld decrepit creatur of maist bais degrie of onie that could be found in the countrey." It is comical to hear Knox described as a dandy; it is equally so to find Ninian Wingate taunting him for his "southron tongue." He appears to have been both Anglified and dandyfied.

be severely punished: That order should be taken to give relief to the poor labourers of the ground from the unreasonable payment of tithes, taken over their heads without their consent.[1]

The first of these articles asked the queen to renounce her religion. That she should be compelled to do so had always been the opinion of Knox, but not of Moray. Now they were at one. It could not have been expected that the queen would yield to such a compulsory method of conversion; but she made a conciliatory reply, and declared that all her Protestant subjects would enjoy the same liberty of conscience which she claimed for herself, and that she was willing to leave the ratification of the Reformed faith to the Estates of the realm. This was not deemed to be enough; perhaps no declaration whatever would. But an object had been gained. It was important that religious enthusiasm should give its aid to political craft, and therefore the cry was raised that the Church was in danger; but the people in general were shrewd enough to see that it was raised for factious purposes; and indeed there is reason to believe that there was less cause for alarm at this juncture than at any period since the queen's arrival in the realm. She had recently gone so far as to attend a Protestant sermon; she had admitted three of the superintendents to an interview, and declared her willingness to listen to discussion regarding disputed points of faith; she had expressed a desire to hear Erskine preach, whom she appears to have regarded with kindness since his attempt to comfort her under the rebukes of Knox; and at that very time she had requested the most powerful of the Protestant nobles to meet her at Perth, that some arrangements might be made regarding their religion, but they declined to meet her under various pretences.

It was known that the queen, in the company of Lord Darnley, was to pass from Perth to Callander. The discontented lords, with the approbation of the English resident, resolved to waylay them; but the queen got a hint of what was intended, and was so early in her saddle that she gave them the slip.

On the morning of Sunday the 29th of July, Mary, attired in black velvet, was married to Lord Darnley in the Chapel of Holyrood. The ceremony was performed according to the rites of the Catholic Church, but immediately after it was over Darnley, who, though a Catholic, wished to trim his sails for

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 28, 29.

Protestant favour, left the chapel, not to be present at the service of the mass. On Sunday the 19th of August, he repaired to St Gile's to hear John Knox preach. Knox chose his text from Isaiah—"O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us." He expatiated on the government of wicked princes, who were sent to plague nations for their sins, and "amongst other things said, that God set in that station, for the offences and ingratitude of the people, boys and women," and then went on to declare "that God had justly punished Ahab and his posterity because he would not take order with the harlot Jezebel."[1] A kind of throne had been erected in the church, that the young king might sit in state and listen to the sermon; but he soon began to perceive that the preacher was coarsely lecturing himself and the queen, and left the church boiling with indignation. When he got home to the palace, he could eat no dinner, and went out to hawk in the afternoon, that he might soothe his choler in the open air.

We have refrained up to this time from saying much regarding these pulpit exhibitions of Knox. The liberty of the pulpit is certainly a thing quite as sacred as the liberty of the press. It were a grievous calamity, even now, if the preachers of the gospel were restricted to speak only the prevalent opinions of the court; it had been a greater calamity still had it been so in the days of the Reformation, when the press was yet in its infancy, and the pulpit the only means of acting on the intelligence of the people. Had the preachers become the mouthpiece of princes, had they gilded fashionable vices, recommended obedience to tyrannical decrees, exalted kings into gods, the preaching of those truths which should make men free would have been converted into a means for their enslavement. A woe is on the country where despotism cannot be denounced as a sin; where the people cannot be told that God has made them free. But liberty is ever apt to degenerate into licentiousness, and the law of libel has been devised, which now operates as a check upon the licentiousness alike of the pulpit and the press. In no place, however sacred, can a man be indulged with an unbridled latitude of speech; men's characters, feelings, interests, must be protected from the assaults of envy, malice, and falsehood. If a man will speak, he must be responsible for what he says. Knox would have

---

[1] Knox's History, book iv.

it, that for what he said in the pulpit he was answerable only to God—a dangerous doctrine.

The truth is, Knox in the pulpit was stronger than Mary in her palace, and all his harsh and uncharitable speeches against her escaped with impunity. But when Knox is placed at the bar of a posterity which is stronger than the strongest, and cannot be overawed, he cannot be acquitted. We do not condemn him for introducing politics into the pulpit, for at such a crisis that was inevitable; we do not condemn him for unveiling foreign conspiracies, for that was patriotic; but we condemn him for attacking with such coarse virulence persons whose position should have commanded respect. It was too bad that a queen who had as yet been convicted of no crime but a conscientious attachment to the religion in which she had been educated, should be publicly compared to every harlot, murderer, and idolater mentioned in the Old Testament, and that even prayer should have been prostituted to the purposes of abuse. Nor can we accept the apologetic plea that his invectives seem coarse only to the squeamish delicacy of modern times; that his calumnious way of speaking was the current language of the period. Knox was blamed by his compeers, remonstrated with, threatened, but in vain. Lethington reasoned with him, Moray reasoned with him. His best friends, as he himself confesses, were scandalized and estranged from him by his violence; and Randolph the English resident, notwithstanding his favour for the faction to which Knox belonged, again and again alludes to his unseasonable severity. Nor did the Reformation require such vituperative speeches. In some respects it was injured by them. They gave deep cause of offence to the court; they cooled the affection of many of the nobles; and were probably one of the reasons which deferred for so long a suitable provision for the Reformed ministry.

Knox was not perfect, as no man is. He was coarse, fierce, dictatorial; but he had great redeeming qualities—qualities which are seldom found in such stormy, changeful periods as that in which he lived. He was consistent, sincere, unselfish, far-seeing. From first to last he pursued the same straight, unswerving course, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left; firm amid continual vicissitudes; and if he could have burned and disembowelled unhappy Papists, he would have done it with the fullest conviction that he was doing God service. He hated Popery with a perfect hatred; and

regarding Mary and her mother as its chief personations in the land, he followed them through life with a rancour which was all the more deadly because it was rooted in religion. The suspicions he had of their designs have been proved to be well founded. He was perhaps fond of power and popularity, but he gained them by no mean compliances. On a question of principle he would quarrel with the highest. His hands were clean of bribes. He did not grow rich by the spoils of the Reformation. He was content to live and die the minister of St Gile's. Is not such an one, rough and bearish though he be, more to be venerated than the supple, time-serving Churchmen who were the tools of the English Reformation? Does he not stand out in pleasing relief from the grasping barons with whom he was associated, who hated monks because they coveted their corn-fields, and afterwards disgraced the religion they professed by their feuds, their conspiracies, and cold-blooded assassinations?

Meanwhile the discontented nobles, depending upon the assistance of England, had broken out into open rebellion. A few days after her marriage, Mary placed herself at the head of her troops, chased them from town to town, and finally compelled them to seek shelter in England. They had implored the promised aid from Elizabeth; but Elizabeth had seen that their case was hopeless, and left them to their fate. The faction was broken to pieces. The Earl of Moray and the Abbot of Kilwinning, leaving their discomfited companions at Newcastle, repaired to the court of London. But it was not the policy of Elizabeth to appear openly to favour unsuccessful rebels. They were at first refused admittance; and when they were admitted, they were compelled to go down upon their knees before the imperious queen, in the presence of the ambassadors of France and Spain, and declare that they had not been incited to rebellion by her Majesty; and when they had submitted to this indignity, and uttered this falsehood, they were told to get out of her presence, as they were unworthy traitors.[1] It was a solemn farce on the part of the queen to keep up appearances, as we soon find her exerting herself to procure their pardon.

March 1566.

It is a dark page of our history upon which we now enter. In the month of March a parliament was to be held, in which it was expected that Moray and his associates would be outlawed, and their immense pos-

---

[1] Sir James Melville's Memoirs, pp. 112, 113.

sessions confiscated. The parliament was opened, but its proceedings were suddenly and fearfully stayed. A conspiracy had been organised by the king (who had proved a silly, jealous, libertine lad), the Earl of Morton, Lord Ruthven, the Secretary Maitland, and the banished nobles, to murder Rizzio, who was thought to have too much influence with the queen, to imprison the queen herself, confer upon Darnley the crown-matrimonial, and restore to the rebels their honours and estates. The English queen was made aware of the conspiracy, and there is a strong suspicion that Knox and Craig, the two ministers of Edinburgh, were made privy to it too.[1] On a Saturday evening the unhappy Italian was foully murdered, almost in the presence of the queen. Mary was kept a prisoner in her room. The banished lords were instantly in Edinburgh. Moray was received with affection by his sister, who clung to him in her hour of need, being yet ignorant of the part which he had in the conspiracy. But Mary's influence over her feeble husband was not yet gone. He repented him of his rashness, and fled with her. Their friends gathered around them, they marched upon Edinburgh, and the assassins were obliged to flee for their lives. Darnley now protested his own innocence, but revealed his accomplices, and insisted on their punishment. They, in revenge, produced the documents, which proved not only that he was a party to the conspiracy, but that he had openly asserted the dishonour of his wife. A wrong had been done to Mary which she could not forgive. A solemn bond had been violated with men, who, destitute of all other faith, esteemed fidelity to one another a sacred virtue, and it must be avenged. Less than a year revealed it all.

Mary, now a mother, did not attempt to conceal her estrangement from Darnley; and Darnley, deprived of the royal favour, sunk into universal contempt. The Earl of Bothwell, in the meantime, had made himself useful to the queen, had seized every opportunity of insinuating himself into her favour, and perhaps had already gained her heart. A divorce from Darnley was talked of; but there were difficulties in the way, and

---

[1] This is debateable ground in history. The question is interesting in a historical point of view, but not in a moral point of view, as affecting Knox's character. We know he approved of the murder after it was committed; and to approve of a murder after its commission is in a moral point of view the same as to approve of it before its commission. He was, moreover, a keen advocate of tyrannicide, as Buchanan and other leading men of the time were.

it was abandoned. The simple remedy of desperadoes must be resorted to. A new conspiracy was organised. A new bond for blood was drawn up. It was signed by Bothwell, Huntly, Argyll, Lethington, and Balfour. It was afterwards made known to the Earl of Morton. The plot ramified still more widely: the Archbishop of St Andrews and the Earl of Moray are said to have received intimation of it. The king was to be got rid of by murder. Was Mary ignorant that she was on the eve of a second widowhood? God alone knows all, but a fearful suspicion rests upon her name, and the casket-letters all but prove her guilt. Early on the morning of Monday, the 10th of February 1567, the house in the suburbs of Edinburgh where the king slept was blown up with gunpowder, and the loud report awakened the whole city. A crowd was soon collected on the spot, and the king's body was found in an adjoining field, nearly naked, and entirely unscathed by fire. It was thought he had been caught rushing from the house just before the explosion, and strangled. Bothwell was instantly suspected of the murder: voices in the night proclaimed it; labels secretly posted up in the streets proclaimed it; but none dared openly to accuse him, saving the father of the murdered man. Meanwhile Mary was continually in Bothwell's society, and delayed to bring him to trial. When a trial could no longer be deferred, he appeared before a court constituted after his own liking, surrounded by his own retainers, and overawed by the guns of the castle which he commanded. Lennox, his accuser, was forbidden to approach Edinburgh with more than six followers; and so unattended, he was afraid to come. The indictment was read; no accuser appeared; no witnesses were called; and after this mockery of law and justice, a verdict of "not guilty" was brought in by the jury.

What followed is soon told. It is a story of sin and shame, followed by wretchedness and ruin. Mary married the man who was universally believed to be her husband's murderer. She appears to have been mad in love with him, though one of the most dissolute men of the time. Some even fancy that her passion for him had for the time quenched her zeal for Rome. She sanctioned provisions for the support of the Protestant preachers, cancelled all permissions to use the offices of her own religion, cut down church vestments of cloth of gold to make a robe for her lover, and consented to be married according to the Reformed rites. While her

infatuation lasted, she was willing to sacrifice everything for him, but it was an abandonment of herself to what she knew was bad.[1] Her downward progress in guilt had been awfully rapid—as a woman's always is. She had been living amidst conspirators and assassins, and had learned their ways. Why trace her corruption back to France, which she had left when almost a child: had she not witnessed dark scenes, had she not associated with bloody men in Holyrood House? But when the cup of iniquity is full, it runs over. The nation could bear this burden of guilt no more. A number of the nobles took arms. The people sympathised with them. Resistance was attempted; but, deserted by their troops at Carberry Hill, Bothwell was glad to flee, and Mary to surrender herself into the hands of her subjects. She was brought to Edinburgh, marched through the streets, insulted by the mob, and finally sent as a prisoner to the Castle of Lochleven to await her fate.

While these things were doing, the General Assembly of the Church was sitting. It was of the utmost importance that the lords who had the queen in their power should be joined by their brother peers, the great bulk of whom held back; and the influence of the Assembly was employed for this purpose. The Assembly was prorogued till the 20th of July. Missives were directed to nearly forty influential barons, inviting them to attend; and Knox, Douglas, Row, and Craig were commissioned to wait upon those to whom the missives were sent, to urge by every argument their presence in Edinburgh at the time appointed.[2] The missives calling this extraordinary Assembly mention only the necessity of extirpating Popery, and providing for the Reformed ministry; but the narrative of Knox, as well as subsequent events, makes it clear that the great object was to secure the concurrence of as many nobles as possible to the political revolution that was in progress. Very few of the invited lords appeared. They made the disturbed state of the kingdom a reason for their absence.

The Assembly again met. The revolutionary lords, disappointed of their brethren, and anxious to conciliate the Church, which was omnipotent with the people, promised everything that was asked of them. In the presence of the Assembly they put their hands to a document, promising to

---

[1] Robertson's Concilia, vol. i., Pref. clxxii., clxxiii.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 55-57. Keith, book iii.

have the Parliament of August 1560, which established the Reformation, ratified; the ecclesiastical lands given back to ecclesiastical uses; the education of youth entrusted to the clergy; and idolatry everywhere put down. In the same document they bound themselves to revenge the murder of Darnley, to guard the young prince his son from all danger, to see him educated in the Protestant faith, and to cause all future sovereigns to swear to maintain the Reformed religion previous to their coronation.[1]

Meanwhile, in every coterie in the kingdom it was debated what should be done with the queen. Some proposed she should be divorced from Bothwell, and restored to the throne; some suggested she should take the veil, and spend the remainder of her days in a French monastery. Some gave it as their opinion that she should be deprived of the government, and doomed to perpetual imprisonment; some argued that the short and simple plan was to put her to death. Of what was said and done in the Assembly of the Church in regard to these grave matters, we have no record; we are only told that the debates were sanguinary. But we know that Knox, who had been out of the country since the murder of Rizzio and was now returned, was clamorous for the death of the queen, and Throkmorton wrote to Elizabeth that the Assembly demanded that the murder of the king should be punished according to the laws of God and man.[2] Immediately after the Assembly dissolved, Lord Lindsay proceeded to Lochleven, bearing three documents. The first was a deed of demission by the queen in favour of her infant son; the second was a deed appointing the Earl of Moray regent of the kingdom during the minority of James; the third was a deed empowering the Duke of Chastelherault, and the Earls of Lennox, Argyll, Athole, Morton, Glencairn, and Mar, to govern the realm till the return of Moray from abroad. It is not too much to suppose that these documents were concocted and resolved upon in the Assembly of the Church. With death before her eyes in case of refusal, Mary signed the instruments.

Moray was in France during this amazing revolution, but he now hurried home. He was not long in the country till

---

[1] Fourteenth General Assembly, pp. 65-69. (Book of the Universal Kirk.) Keith, book iii.

[2] Throkmorton to Elizabeth, 25th July. Froude's History, vol. ix. p. 138.

he visited his captive sister at Lochleven. Mary received him with kisses and tears; but instead of being affected by her misfortunes, or remembering the many favours he had received at her hands, he bitterly upbraided her for her crimes, and presented to her mind the possibility of an ignominious death. Bewildered by grief and fear, she besought him as her brother to accept the regency, and so save the country, her infant, and herself. Moray affected to accept with reluctance an office which he had long earnestly desired, for which many affirmed he had all his life-time plotted and schemed. The full height of his ambition was all but attained. On the 22d of August he was declared regent of the kingdom; and the bells of Edinburgh were ringing rejoicings, while Mary was pining in her solitary prison in Lochleven.

CHAPTER XII.

A.D. 1567. THE Regent Moray soon showed that, if he had aspired to rule, his abilities were equal to his ambition. It was immediately felt that the government of the country was no longer in the hands of a woman. The fierce baron in his feudal keep, the bandit on the borders, the gillie in the mountain-pass, knew he might no more rob and murder with impunity. But a large portion of the nobility were discontented with the government; they might at any time organise a formidable opposition to it; and therefore the regent hastened to secure the goodwill of the Protestant ministers, by whose influence chiefly he had clamb to power. Pledges had been given in the last Assembly, and these must be redeemed. On the 15th of December, the parliament met. Its first business was to accept the resignation of the queen, and give its sanction to the coronation of James and the regency of Moray. This done, a series of acts affecting the Church were passed. The parliament of August 1560, which first established the Reformation, had never received the royal sanction; and therefore it was deemed prudent to re-enact its enactments. The jurisdiction of the Pope was abolished; all laws in favour of the Roman Catholic religion were repealed; the

Protestant Confession of Faith was ratified and engrossed in the records; and the saying or hearing of mass was declared to be a crime punishable with confiscation of goods for the first offence, banishment for the second, death for the third. Sticklers for constitutional forms regard this as the true establishment of the Protestant Church; as the previous acts had never been ratified by the head of the State. Legislation proceeded still farther, and declared the Church now established to be the only true Church of Christ, and those only to be members of it who should accept of the Confession as now ratified, and partake of the sacraments as now administered. Another act was passed prohibiting any one from holding office, or from acting as a procurator or notary in any court, till he should first profess the Reformed faith; and another and still more important one, providing that every future sovereign should, at his coronation, swear before the Eternal God that he would maintain the true religion of Christ Jesus, abolish all false religions contrary to the same, and rule the people committed to his charge according to the will of God revealed in His Word, and the lovable laws and constitutions received in the realm. It was a wise piece of legislation. It may have savoured of intolerance to insist on the Catholic queen of a hitherto Catholic country changing her faith because her subjects had changed theirs; but there was no intolerance in a Protestant country notifying to all future expectants of the throne that they must be Protestants if they would be its king. The time chosen, too, was opportune. James was a child, and might be educated in the Protestant faith, and so saved the struggle of overcoming early prejudices, or the hypocrisy of professing a religion which he did not believe.

All was not yet done that was needful to be done. It was needful that arrangements should be made as to the admission of ministers, and stipends for them after they were admitted. In regard to the former, it was "statute and ordained by our sovereign lord, with advice of his dearest regent and the Three Estates of this present parliament," that the examination and admission of ministers should lie with the Church, and that the presentation should lie with the ancient lay patrons; but that if the patron failed to present a properly-qualified person to the superintendent within six months, the right of presentation should lapse to the Church. In the

event of the superintendent refusing to induct the presentee of the patron, it was provided that there might be an appeal to the provincial synod, and from the provincial synod to the General Assembly, whose sentence was to be final. In regard to the stipends of the clergy, an act was passed, proceeding upon the preamble that the ministers had been long defrauded of their stipends, so that they were come to great poverty, and yet that they had continued in their vocation, but that they should be constrained to leave it unless some remedy were provided. It was therefore enacted that the stipends of the clergy should *first* be paid out of the whole thirds of the whole realm, and that not till this was done should the surplus be applied to swell the royal revenue. From this act it is plain that the poverty of the ministers had not arisen altogether from the insufficiency of the stipends assigned to them, but from these, such as they were, being irregularly and imperfectly paid. Their claims were now to be held paramount to all others. But the clergy had claimed the whole patrimony of the Church; the barons who sat in the last Assembly had promised it; the regent is said not to have been opposed to it; but it was too strong a measure to propose and carry in the face of so much greed and selfishness. Hope, however, was kept alive in the minds of the ministers by a clause purporting that the present measure was to be only a temporary one, to serve "ay and quhill the Kirk come to the full possession of its proper patrimonie, quhilk is the teindes." Vain hope! every day was making the thing more hopeless by new alienations.[1]

It is not a little curious to find the same parliament which passed these strongly-Protestant measures ratifying all the civil privileges anciently possessed by the Spiritual Estate of the realm; and by the Spiritual Estate is meant not the Protestant ministers, but the Popish hierarchy. The act regarding the Spiritual Estate is followed by two others ratifying the privileges of the barons and the burghs.[2] Strange that the Popish dignitaries should still be recognised as the first of the Three Estates; that, driven from the Church and the altar, they should still be allowed to sit in the Senate. In the very parliament in which these things were done, four bishops and fourteen abbots sat, and spoke, and voted. They were mostly

---

[1] Acts of Parl. James I., parl. i. chapters i.-xii.

[2] James I., parl. i. chapters xxiv.-xxvi.

Protestants; but it was in virtue of their positions in the Roman hierarchy that they occupied their places.

Dec. 25, 1567. The parliament was hardly dissolved when the General Assembly met. It met bent on enforcing discipline. The Earl of Argyll was taken to task for separating from his wife; and the Countess of Argyll for being present at the Popish baptism of the prince. The Earl declared the fault was not his, but for other offences professed himself willing to submit to the discipline of the Church. The lady confessed her fault, and was ordered to make public repentance in the Chapel Royal at Stirling. John Craig, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, was accused of having published the banns of marriage between the queen and the Earl of Bothwell; but he amply vindicated his conduct by proving that in proclaiming the banns he had openly condemned the marriage. Adam, called Bishop of Orkney, was charged with not visiting the kirks of his province; acting as a judge in the Court of Session; keeping company with Sir Francis Bothwell, a Popish priest, bestowing upon him benefices, and placing him as a minister; and, above all, solemnizing the marriage between the queen and the Earl of Bothwell. The bishop pleaded that his health would not allow him to remain in Orkney; that he was ignorant of Sir Francis being a Papist; but being unable to exculpate himself for marrying the queen, he was suspended from his office, and not restored till he professed his penitence publicly in the Chapel of Holyrood. The Bishop of Galloway was accused of not having visited the churches in his district for three years; of having ceased to plant churches; of haunting the court too much; of acting as a judge and privy-counsellor; of having resigned the Abbey of Inchaffray in favour of a child; and having set lands in feu to the prejudice of the kirk.[1]

In the beginning of May 1568, the news spread through the country like wildfire that the queen had escaped from her prison in Lochleven. Escaped she certainly had, and in a few days she found herself at Hamilton, surrounded by a great majority of the nobility and gentry of the realm, eager for her restoration to the throne. But the Regent Moray proved himself equal to the occasion, and in a few days more the unhappy Mary, from the top of Langside Hill, saw her hopes blighted, and her army scattered like chaff; and,

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, Dec. 1567. Keith, book iii. chap. ii.

turning her horse's head to the south, she sought shelter in England—a fugitive from her ancestral kingdom—a suppliant at the feet of Elizabeth. How it fared with her all the world knows:—Accused of the murder of her husband by her own brother; detained for eighteen long years in captivity; finally brought to the block; she went from the world leaving behind her a name not unsullied by suspicion, but which still moves every heart to pity her misfortunes, and almost to forget her crimes.

Moray did not long enjoy his regency. On the 23d day of January 1570, in passing through the town of Linlithgow, he was shot at from a window by Hamilton of Bothwellhaugh. The street was narrow, the crowd of spectators obstructed the way, the assassin had time to take deliberate aim, and the wound proved mortal. His body was conveyed to Edinburgh, and followed to the grave by an immense concourse of mourners. When the procession reached the Church of St Gile's, the coffin was placed upon a bier in front of the pulpit, and while it lay there, in the view of the people, Knox preached a sermon from the text—"Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord." Lowered into his last resting-place in St Anthony's aisle, his epitaph was written by the classic pen of Buchanan, in which he is bewailed as the best man of his age, and the common father of his country.

Posterity has vindicated the encomium of Buchanan by bestowing upon Moray the enviable name of the Good Regent. Yet the impartial reader of history may find it difficult to assign such unqualified praise. Moray's devotion to England may be thought inconsistent with patriotism, his conduct to his sister at variance with natural affection, his share in bloody conspiracies as opposed to true Christianity. But be this as it may, he undoubtedly possessed great qualities. He was born to govern, and, during his short regency, he rendered a turbulent country peaceful and happy. His private life was irreproachable. "His house," says the affectionate Buchanan,[1] "like an holy temple, was free not only from impiety, but even from wanton words. After dinner and supper he always caused a chapter out of the Holy Bible to be read; and though he had still a learned man to interpret it, yet if there were any eminent scholars there (as frequently there were a great many, and such were

---

[1] History of Scotland, book xix.

still respected by him) he would ask their opinions of it, which he did not out of a vain ambition, but a desire to conform himself to its rules." There can be no doubt but that his attachment to Protestantism was sincere, persevered in, as it was, from boyhood till the day of his death. The preachers might well bewail him, for he courted their favour, and showed himself on all occasions attentive to their interests. His enemies accused him of aiming at the supreme power, and he was scarcely in his grave till a document was put in circulation, purporting to be an account of an interview accidentally overheard between him and some of his friends, in which Knox, Lord Lindsay, and others, advised him to make himself strong with men of war, and assume the regency for life.[1] The cleverness of the squib deceived many, but it was a forgery, and Knox, from the pulpit, declared it to be so. But while opposing factions assailed and lampooned him, the great bulk of the nation, as they had experienced his virtues, lamented his loss. He is described as being of a commanding presence, but possessed of a blunt open manner, which begot confidence. It was noted, however, that after he acquired the regency he became more haughty, and kept the nobles at a distance. It was probably policy more than pride that prompted him to do so.

The death of Moray left the country without a governor, and for some months it was cruelly torn by the contending factions of the king and queen. The faction of the queen numbered most names among the nobility; but the faction of the king had the support of the Church and the English Government. In the month of July the Earl of Lennox was raised to the regency on account of his near relationship to the infant king, but the queen's faction refused to acknowledge his authority, and as he was entirely destitute of the vigour of Moray, the country continued to be distracted by civil dissensions. These were industriously fomented by Elizabeth, whose constant policy it was to secure peace to herself by sowing troubles among her neighbours.

Sir William Kirkaldy of Grange commanded the Castle of Edinburgh, and threw in his lot with the queen's party. The city lay at his mercy. It began to fill with the adherents of Mary. Knox's health was failing, but his courage was unshaken, and from the pulpit he denounced Grange as a throat-cutter and murderer. His life was threatened in consequence.

---

[1] Bannatyne's Memoriales.

When the Assembly met in March 1570, an anonymous paper was thrown in at the door, charging him with speaking of the queen as an idolater, adulteress, and murderer—treating her as a reprobate, and refusing to pray for her. Placards to the same effect were pasted on the door of the church. Knox boldly answered them, and vindicated his conduct without denying it.[1] On another occasion, a musket ball came crackling in at the window of his house at the Netherbow Port, where the thoughtful bailies had made "ane warme studye of dailles to the minister, John Knox, above the hall of the same, with lyght and windocks thereunto and all other necessaries."[2] The place was getting too hot for him, and, by the advice of his friends, he retired to St Andrews. The Bishop of Galloway occupied his pulpit, and preached in a manner more pleasing to the queen's party.[3]

James Melville was at this time a student in St Leonard's College, and from his pen we have one of the most interesting sketches of the Reformer in this the last period of his life:—"Of all the benefits," says he, in his interesting, graphic style, "which I had that year was the coming of that most notable prophet and apostle of our nation, Mr John Knox, to St Andrews, who, by the faction of the queen occupying the castle and town of Edinburgh, was compelled to remove therefrom with a number of the best, and chose to come to St Andrews. I heard him teach there the prophecy of Daniel that summer and the winter following. I had my pen and my little book, and took away such things as I could comprehend. In the opening up of his text he was moderate the space of half an hour, but when he entered to application, he made me so to grew and tremble that I could not hold a pen to write. . . . Mr Knox would sometimes come into our college-yard, and call us scholars unto him and bless us, and exhort us to know God and his work in our country, and stand by the good cause, to use our time well, and learn the good instructions, and follow the good example of our masters." "I saw him every day of his doctrine," Melville again testifies, "go *hulie and fiar*, with a furring of martricks about his neck, a staff in the one hand, and good, godly Richard Bannatyne, his servant, holding up the other *oxtar*, from the abbey to the parish church, and by the said Richard and another servant lifted up to the

---

[1] Bannatyne's Memoriales.

[2] Act of Council. Laing's Pref. to Knox's Works, vol. vi.

[3] Bannatyne's Memoriales.

pulpit, where he behoved to lean at his first entry, but ere he had done with his sermon he was so active and vigorous, that he was like to ding the pulpit in *blads*, and fly out of it."[1] No picture of the Reformer could be more perfect than this—it stands out before us like a stereoscopic view—we see him walk, we hear him speak. And it is all the more interesting, as it presents him to us old and worn out with his life-long work; his hard battle against mass-saying priests and sacrilegious nobles.

On the 7th of April 1571, John Hamilton, the last Roman Catholic Archbishop of St Andrews, was publicly hanged in his episcopal robes upon a gibbet at Stirling. After the battle of Langside he had been declared a traitor by the Earl of Moray, and after living for a time under the shelter of his powerful friends, he had sought refuge in the Castle of Dumbarton, which was held for the queen. When it was surprised and taken, he was brought to trial, accused of being privy to the murders of Darnley and Moray, condemned, hanged, quartered. He was a man able, indefatigable, and faithful to his Church, through good and bad report; but like most of his compeers, he appears to have been utterly destitute of principle.

It was now becoming more and more evident that something must be done to give the Church a polity. The "First Book of Discipline" had never been sanctioned by the Legislature; the Church had a nationally-received creed, but not a nationally-received government. The old Spiritual Estate still existed as one of the Estates of the realm. Its property had never been confiscated; its voice in the parliament had never been denied. But the bishops and abbots were gradually dying out; and to replace them by Protestant laymen was felt to be a false and anomalous proceeding. These bishops and abbots, thus dying without successors, were the acknowledged superiors of a large part of the land of the country, a considerable proportion of which was let in feu and heritage; and now the feuars and heritable tenants could not get entry to their lands, for there was none to give it. To rectify this an act was passed in the parliament which met in August 1571, declaring that all such ecclesiastical feuars and tenants should henceforth hold their feus and possessions direct from the king.[2] It was an im-

---

[1] James Melville's Diary, Ban. Ed.

[2] James VI., parl. ii. chap. xxxviii.

portant measure, and in some respects amounted to a confiscation of a great part of the Church property of the kingdom.

But much land and tithes were still undisposed of, and who was to get these? The Protestant Church earnestly and importunately claimed them, but the men in power had destined the most of them for themselves. There was a perfect scramble for abbacies, priories, and bishoprics; and the lawless state of the country made the work rapid and easy. Either faction required to purchase partisans, and there was no price they could so conveniently offer as a benefice. Mary bestowed upon Grange the Priory of St Andrews. "Brother William," wrote Randolph to him, in a bantering letter, "it was indeed most wonderful unto me, when I heard that you should become a prior. That vocation agreeth not with anything that ever I knew in you, saving for your religious life led under the cardinal's hat, when we were both students in Paris."[1] The Earl of Glencairn had set his heart upon the Archbishopric of Glasgow, and sulkily refused to take any part in a parliament because it was refused him.[2] The defection of the Earl of Argyll from the party of the queen to that of the king was ascribed to an ecclesiastical bribe. "The greedy and insatiable appetite of benefices," says the author of the "Diurnal of Occurrents," "was the most cause thereof, for in his time there was none brought under the king's obedience but for reward either given or promised."[3] The Archbishop of St Andrews was scarcely cut down from his gallows, when the Earl of Morton got a gift of his archbishopric from the Regent Lennox.

But under what plea and by what tenure were these bishoprics, abbacies, and priories to be held? The nobles who got them did not contemplate becoming ecclesiastics. They scarcely dared to contemplate the sudden secularization of so much ecclesiastical property. The nation was not prepared for it. The Church would vehemently resist it; and the Church had already shown itself strong enough to pull down and set up rulers. Besides, was it politic, was it wise, to allow the Spiritual Estate—the first estate in the realm—to come to nought? Were none but barons and burgesses henceforward to sit in parliament? Was the old balance of the constitution to be destroyed? Would the throne be safe, would the aris-

---

[1] Letter, Randolph to the Laird of Grange, 1st May 1570. State-Paper Office. Quoted by Tytler, Hist., vol. vii.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents, 13th October 1570.

[3] Ibid. 1571.

tocracy be safe, in presence of the rising power of the burghs, without the aid of the clergy? Moreover, how was the original framework of the College of Justice to be maintained? where were its eight ecclesiastical senators to come from, seeing the Church had debarred its superintendents and ministers from acting as judges? Even laying aside the constitution of the court, was not the ecclesiastical body the one most fitted to supply able lawyers, from the superior training of its members? Could no plan be formed by which the Spiritual Estate might be preserved, the Court of Session supplied with judges, and a portion at least of the Church's revenues pocketed by the patrons? These thoughts must have passed through many minds at the period we speak of. In a little we may be able to trace the result.

A.D. 1572.

On the 12th of January 1572, a Convention of the Church assembled at Leith. By whom it was convened is unknown. It was not a regular Assembly, but it assumed to itself "the strength, force, and effect of a General Assembly," and it was attended by "the superintendents, barons, commissioners to plant kirks, commissioners of provinces, towns, kirks, and ministers."[1] At its third session, and on the fifteenth day of the month, it appointed a committee to meet with a committee of the Privy Council, and confer upon matters affecting the Church. On the very next day the Privy Council appointed a corresponding committee to meet and confer with the Commissioners of the Church, upon the matters entrusted to them.[2] These two committees embraced the leading men of the Church and State, and represented very fairly every party and every sentiment; but it is impossible to believe that the Convention and Privy Council would have worked with such perfect harmony, unless the whole proceedings had been previously arranged.

By the 1st of February the joint committees framed a concordat, of which the following articles were the chief:—

1. That the names of archbishops and bishops, and the bounds of dioceses, should remain as they were before the Reformation, at least till the majority of the king, or till a different arrangement should be made by the parliament; and that to every cathedral church there should be attached a chapter of learned men; but that the bishops should have no

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, January 1572.

[2] Calderwood's History. Spottiswood's History.

more power than was possessed by the superintendents, and should like them be subject to the General Assemblies.

2. That abbots and priors should be continued as parts of the Spiritual Estate of the realm; that before they were admitted they should be examined by the Church, and care taken that from the benefices within their bounds enough was secured for the adequate maintenance of the ministers; but that being admitted, they might be promoted to act as senators of the College of Justice.

3. That qualified ministers should be placed in every part of the country; that livings under the yearly value of £40 should be conferred upon readers, and those of greater value upon ministers capable of dispensing the sacraments; that no pluralities should be allowed, every minister constrained to reside within his parish, and required at his admission to sign the Confession of Faith, and take an oath of allegiance to the king.

4. That all provostries, prebends, collegiate churches, and chaplainries should be bestowed by their respective patrons upon bursars or students in grammar, arts, theology, law, or medicine.[1]

Such was the famous concordat agreed upon by the Church and State in Scotland in 1572. The regent instantly approved of it; but it remained to be seen whether the General Assembly would give its sanction to the proceedings of its commissioners. The Earl of Morton did not wait till the General Assembly would meet, but at once took action upon the terms of the concordat. He had obtained a gift of the Archbishopric of St Andrews; he presented to it John Douglas, Rector of the University. A chapter was held, and Douglas gave proof of his ability to preach. The day for his admission was fixed, and John Knox preached the sermon, but believing there had been a Simoniacal paction between the patron and presentee, he denounced an anathema upon both. John Winram read the forms, and asked the questions used in the admission of superintendents; and thereafter the Bishop of Orkney, the Superintendent of Lothian, and David Lindsay laid their hands upon Douglas, and embraced him in sign of admission.[2] The Church of Scotland had once more an archbishop.

The work being begun went briskly on. James Boyd was appointed to the Archiepiscopal See of Glasgow, Andrew Paton

[1] Calderwood's History. Spottiswood's History.

[2] Calderwood's History, 1572.

to Dunkeld, Andrew Graham[1] to Dunblane, George Douglas to Moray. The episcopal bench was now once more nearly full; for Gordon was already Bishop of Galloway, Bothwell of Orkney, Campbell of Brechin, Stuart of Caithness, Hamilton of Argyle, Carswell of the Isles. It was more than suspected that these men—at least those of them who had recently received their investiture—had consented to enjoy the episcopal titles, with but a small part of the episcopal revenues. They were the creatures of the lordly patrons. "There be three kinds of bishops," said Adamson, with severe irony,[2] "My Lord Bishop, My Lord's Bishop, and the Lord's Bishop. My Lord Bishop was in the Papistry; My Lord's Bishop is now, when my lord gets the fat of the benefice, and the bishop makes his title sure; the Lord's Bishop is the true minister of the gospel."[3] The people, too, must have their jest. It was once the custom in Scotland to set up a stuffed calf's skin before cows when being milked, under the belief that the milk was made thereby to flow more freely into the pail of the dairymaid. This stuffed calf was called a *tulchan*. The coarse humour of the nation found vent in nick-naming the new race of prelates "tulchan-bishops," as they were thought no better than stuffed calves, set up to make the benefice yield its revenues to their lord.[4]

The General Assembly met at St Andrews on the 6th of March, but there is no record of its having done anything in regard to the Convention at Leith. It again met, however, at Perth on the 6th of August, and the following minute was put upon the register with reference to the concordat:—"In it are found certain names, such as archbishop, bishop, dean, archdean, chamber, chapter, which names were thought slanderous and offensive to the ears of many of the brethren, appearing to sound of Papistry; therefore the whole Assembly in one voice, as well they that were in commission at Leith as others, solemnly protest that they intend not by using such names to ratify, consent, and agree to any kind of Papistry or superstition, and wish rather the same names may be changed

---

[1] Graham was a layman when he was all at once made a bishop; but so was St Ambrose.

[2] Adamson is thought to have had his wit sharpened by disappointment. He afterwards got promotion to an archbishopric, and then he changed his way of speaking.

[3] James Melville's Diary.

[4] Calderwood's History. James Melville's Diary.

to others that are not slanderous and offensive, and, in like manner, protest that the said heads and articles agreed upon be only received as an interim, until farther and more perfect order be obtained at the hands of the king's majesty's regent and nobility, for the which they will press as occasion shall serve; unto the which protestation the whole Assembly in one voice adheres."[1]

The whole Church, in General Assembly convened, thus gave its consent to the concordat of Leith; but it was a reluctant consent, and accompanied by a protest that the arrangement was not exactly such as they would have wished, and that even while submitting to it, they would regard it as merely temporary, and use every effort to secure a better. It is surprising, however, to find the Church which had approved of the "First Book of Discipline," and banished bishops from its policy for twelve years, giving even such a conditional sanction as this to a concordat which reintroduced the whole machinery of the Papacy. It was plainly a compromise—an expediency measure—agreed to in the hope that good would result from it. Things were still in a chaotic state, and pure Presbyterianism was an after-growth.

The Church had in vain attempted to get its favourite policy ratified by parliament. It had in vain struggled to get possession of its patrimony. In had in vain argued that the bishoprics and abbacies should be dissolved, and their revenues applied for the maintenance of the ministry, the education of the youthhead, and the support of the poor. The bishoprics and abbacies were maintained as if they were indissoluble. Some of them were already bestowed upon laymen, and the ministers of the Protestant Church were poorly paid out of the thirds of benefices. The collection of these even the regent had recently stopped,[2] and beggary was at the door. What was to be done? The only way of obtaining the episcopal revenues was by reintroducing the episcopal office. None but a bishop could hold a bishopric, so had the law ordained. The law could not be safely abrogated; the balance of the constitution could not be safely destroyed;

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, August 1572.

[2] The avaricious Morton had persuaded the clergy, that if they would allow him to collect the thirds, he would arrange to have every minister's stipend paid out of the teinds of the parish where he served. They soon discovered that they were worse off than ever, and clamoured for a return to the system established by Moray. (Calderwood's History. Book of the Universal Kirk, &c., &c.)

the First Estate in the realm could not be suffered to perish.[1] These arguments were no doubt pressed again and again upon the ministers, by men whose influence would give weight to their logic. The ministers regarded archbishops, bishops, deans, and chapters as things lawful, but not expedient—"they sounded of papistry;" but now, under the pressure of a still stronger expediency, they received them into the Church. That the Church did sanction the proceedings of the Convention at Leith, and succumb to a species of episcopacy, it were idle to deny. In the sederunts of the Assemblies henceforward, the bishops are mentioned immediately before the superintendents; by the Assembly of August 1574, the regent was petitioned to provide qualified persons to vacant bishoprics; and in the Assembly of March 1575, the Bishop of Glasgow was raised to the moderator's chair.[2] But it was not always, nor even often, that bishops enjoyed this dignity; on the contrary, we frequently find them hauled before the court for negligence in the discharge of their duties, and altogether they were never greatly honoured in the Church.

Knox yielded to the same necessity under which the Church had bowed. Preferring the Presbyterian polity which he had seen at Geneva to the Prelatic under which he had ministered in England, he had yet never held diocesan episcopacy to be anti-Christian. Anxious above all things to secure the Church's patrimony, he was ready to submit to anything but a surrender of principle to encompass his heart's desire. He submitted to the introduction of episcopacy. Too frail to be present at the Assembly of August 1572, he sent certain articles for its consideration; he recommended the Church to petition the regent that all vacant bishoprics should be filled up by properly-qualified persons within a year after they had become vacant, "according to the order taken in Leith by the Commissioners of the Nobility and of the Kirk, in the month of January last," and that a complaint should be made as to the giving of the Bishopric of Ross to the Lord Methven, a mere layman. He farther recommended that "an act should be made decerning and ordaining all

---

[1] Melville confessed that many of the nobles were against his policy, just because it implied the destruction of the Spiritual Estate; and we find King James frequently asking the Assembly what was to become of this Estate if the bishops were abolished. He dreaded such a change in the constitution. (Book of the Universal Kirk.)

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk.

bishops admitted to the order of the Kirk now received to give account of their whole rents and intromissions therewith once a year, as the Kirk shall appoint, for such causes as the Kirk may easily consider the same to be most expedient and necessary."[1]

If Knox agreed to recognise episcopacy in order to secure the episcopal revenues, he knew there was a danger of being cheated by Simonists. There were whispers abroad of pactions being made between patrons and presentees—the lords who held the bishoprics, and their creatures who were to get them. He sounded a note of alarm. He wrote to the Assembly which met at Stirling in 1571: "Unfaithful and traitors to the flock shall ye be before the Lord Jesus if that with your consent, directly or indirectly, ye suffer unworthy men to be thrust into the ministry of the Church, under what pretence that ever it be. Remember the Judge before whom you must make account, and resist that tyranny as ye would hell-fire. This battle, I grant, will be hard, but in the second point it will be harder; that is, that with the like uprightness and strength in God, ye withstand the merciless devourers of the patrimony of the Church. If men will spoil, let them do it to their own peril and condemnation; but communicate you not with their sins, of what state soever they be."[2] He preached, as we have already seen, before the inauguration of Douglas, but he is said to have denounced both the giver and receiver;[3] and when he recommends the Assembly to compel bishops to give to the Church an account of their intromissions with the revenues of their Sees, it was most probably to prevent them from being paid away as the price of the presentation.[4] In all this there was honesty and wisdom.

It was a mongrel prelacy that was thus introduced into Scotland—a cross betwixt Popery and Presbytery. It was not of the true Roman breed. It was not even of the Anglican. It could not pretend to the apostolical descent. The lordly archbishop must sit in the Assemby as an humble member, while the humble minister presided as moderator, and must be ready at all times to give an account of his conduct, it

---

[1] This letter is given in Calderwood's History; it is also copied in the Appendix to Robertson's History.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, 1571.

[3] Calderwood's Hist., 1572.

[4] Articles to Assembly of August 1573, above referred to, given in Calderwood and Robertson's Histories.

might be to have his episcopal pride brought low by the rebukes of a presbyter. But the most marvellous thing is that the abbot was to be resuscitated as well as the bishop; and though he might not be allowed to minister in the churches, he might win his bread by sitting on the judicial bench. Abbesses would probably have been revived too had they formed a part of any estate, or had it been possible to find any work for them to do. But they could be turned to no account, and therefore were allowed to perish. When Dame Christian Ballenden, Prioress of the "Priorissie of the Senis, besyde the burrowmure of Edinburgh," departed this life, the Earl of Morton, "understanding that in the Convention of the States of the realm consideration was had that nunneries are not meet to be conferred and given to women, according to the first foundation in the tyme of ignorance . . . . appoints Captain Ninian Cockburn his highness's chamberlain and factor to the said Priorissie of the Senis."[1] So the captain succeeded to the prioress, and the order became extinct.

On the 24th of November 1572, John Knox, the Scottish Reformer, rested from his labours. His spirit was vigorous to the last, but his body was worn out with worry and toil. He did not die too soon. His work was done; the sore battle was fought; the land was purged of idols. Standing by his open grave, the Earl of Morton, now regent, pronounced his brief but true eulogium—"There lies one who neither feared nor flattered flesh."[2]

His character is not difficult to understand, it flashes strongly out in almost every act of his life. A man of strong convictions, of fearless courage, and a sanguine temperament, he had no toleration for the opinions of others if they were different from his own. Though he must have had his own struggle before he threw off the religion of his childhood, he had no sympathy with those who could not change their faith, and curse everything they had formerly revered. In some respects he was more a politician than a theologian, and worked quite as much for the liberty of his country as for the Reformation of his Church. The greatest statesmen of the day on both sides of the border recognised his ability, and the Protestant, selfish Elizabeth hated and

---

[1] Register of Privy Seal, quoted in a note to M'Crie's Life of Melville.

[2] James Melville's Diary. Calderwood's version is—"Here lieth a man who in his life never feared the face of a man; who hath been often threatened with dag and dagger, but yet hath ended his days in peace and honour."

feared him almost as much as the Popish finessing Mary. Though never ambitious of being more than an Edinburgh minister—perhaps because he knew that in no other position could he be more powerful—he was the associate and adviser of the greatest nobles in the kingdom. The influence of his eloquence is well hit off in a letter from Randolph to Cecil. "The voice of that one man," said he, "is able to put more life in us in one hour than five hundred trumpets blustering in our ears." He appears to have been of small and fragile make. "I know not," says Calderwood, "if ever God placed in a frail and weak little body a more godly and greater spirit."[1] He is described as fond of trinkets and dress. It is certain he writes, and he is said to have spoken, the English rather than the Scotch of his time, but it is difficult to believe it was from any affectation of the southron tongue. His "History of the Reformation" is one of the most graphic racy books in any language, and without reading it it is impossible to understand either the man or the scenes amid which he lived. Its broad humour, its rollicking fun, its relish for the ludicrous, mingle strangely with its fierce dogmatism and bitter hatred, and show of how many opposite elements the Reformer was made. Though a virulent enemy of Popery, he was really a broad Churchman; he preached his evangel as readily in England as in Scotland, and his sons went to Cambridge to be educated as ministers of the English Church. It is pleasant to find at the end of a life during which the harder features of his character were most displayed a touch of true genial humour. When lying on his death-bed, and drawing near to his end, he was visited by two friends, whom he bid stay to dinner, and insisted upon tapping a hogshead of wine in his cellar, and while they were drinking their glass, he pressed them to send for some more, as he did not expect to live till it was done.[2]

The Regent Lennox had been killed in a sudden encounter at Stirling. Mar had succeeded him, but death soon deprived

---

[1] Hist., vol. iii. p. 238.

[2] We are fortunate in having what may be regarded as an authentic likeness of the Reformer in the Icones of Beza, engraved in wood, from a portrait by Vaensoun, sent to Geneva by King James. We have, perhaps, a still better representation of the man in the engraving by Hondius, evidently from the same original, though somewhat changed. There is the powerful head well placed on the shoulders, the thoughtful eye ready to kindle into flame, the firm set mouth, the flowing beard. Carlyle, indeed, denounces the Beza portrait as no better than a boiled figurehead, and not the image of a man who could do and dare what Knox had

him of his honours, and now Morton, the fourth regent within six years, was at the head of affairs; but still the country lay bleeding with civil wounds. The Castle of Edinburgh, beetling on the top of its lofty crag, was held by the Lairds of Grange and Lethington for the queen; and the miserable city at its base was exposed equally to the guns of the fortress and the fury of its assailants. At length a battering-train from England compelled a surrender, and Kirkaldy and Maitland were at the mercy of Morton. Kirkaldy was hanged at the market-cross of Edinburgh. Maitland suddenly died before his doom was known; but it was said that he anticipated it by swallowing poison in his prison.

Kirkaldy was probably the ablest soldier, and Maitland the ablest statesman of his day. Either had played an important part in accomplishing the Reformation. When Kirkaldy was hanging on the gibbet, the Protestants thought of a prediction of Knox, that this would be his end for taking part with the queen; the Papists remembered that he had begun his career by the slaughter of a cardinal. Maitland was much the greater man of the two, and had played a greater part. His life had been full of change. We first find him in the company of the Reformers, but advocating an outward compliance with the rites of Rome. We next find him in the service of the queen regent, and only deserting to the Congregation when her cause was hopeless. In the parliament of 1560, which established the Reformation, his abilities and zeal raised him to the speakership. When Queen Mary sought her native country, he attached himself heart and soul to her interest, and slighted the parliament in which he had played so conspicuous a part. He shared with Moray the duties of government; and, while thus employed, Randolph, the English resident, describes "the Lord James as dealing, according to his nature, rudely, homely, bluntly; the Laird of Lethington more delicately and finely, yet nothing swerving from the other in mind and effect."[1] His great ambition at that time was the union of the

dared and done, and prefers the altogether unauthentic Somerville portrait; but Wilkie has shown how the face and figure, in repose in Vaensoun's portrait, could be thrown into action, and kindled into fire, in his great picture of Knox preaching before the Lords of the Congregation. See an interesting paper on Scottish Historical Portraits in the Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries, vol. xi. part i.; also Carlyle's Essay on the Portraits of Knox. Dr Laing gave Wilkie the loan of Hondius' portrait to be used in his historical picture.

[1] Randolph to Cecil, 24th October, 1561. Keith.

kingdoms. But Maitland's brain was unfortunately fertile of plots. He was in the conspiracy to murder Rizzio; in the conspiracy to murder the king. When the nobles rose to avenge the murder of the king, Maitland, though himself one of the chief of the assassins, joined them, and he was too able a man to be put away. When Moray received the regency, for a time Lethington was his principal adviser, but his heart appears to have been with the exiled Mary, and he began to plot for her return. Apprehended, and about to be brought to trial for his part in the Darnley conspiracy, Kirkaldy, by a stratagem, had him conveyed to the castle, where, during a long siege, his statesman-like diplomacy seconded the courage and skill of the military knight. Though the character of neither is defensible, we cannot but admire their abilities, and pity their fate.

In the summer of 1574, ANDREW MELVILLE, a man destined to play an important part in the history of the Church, returned to his native country, after an absence of ten years. These ten years he had spent at the most celebrated seats of learning on the Continent. He had studied both at Paris and at Poictiers. Driven from France by the civil wars, he turned his eyes toward Geneva, at that period the chosen asylum of civil and religious liberty. He travelled all the long way upon foot, as he had previously done from Dieppe to Paris, and from Paris to Poictiers. His scholarship almost immediately secured for him the vacant Professorship of Humanity in the Academy, and admittance to the literary society in the town. It was a marvellous society that had congregated in this little republican city, cradled among the everlasting hills, and shut out from the rest of the world; men who had fled from every country of Europe, that they might breathe a freer atmosphere. Calvin was no more; but Theodore Beza occupied his place, and almost rivalled his renown. Scaliger came with the refugees who escaped through the passes of the Jura, after the horror of St Bartholomew's Day. One hundred and twenty French ministers are said to have been all at one time in the town.[1] As they spoke one to another of the wrongs they had suffered, the perils they had escaped, the friends they had seen butchered before their eyes, can we wonder that there was generated beneath the broad shadows of the Alps a deep hatred of despotism and Popery, and a fervent love of liberty. In this school Andrew Melville was nursed—

---

[1] M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. i.

with these men he held converse; he was the personal friend of the most distinguished amongst them; and when he returned to Scotland, he was already a well-known and celebrated man. The Universities of St Andrews and Glasgow competed for his services; he chose the latter, and, as its Principal, soon laid among the ruins of the ancient school the foundations of its future fame.[1]

Episcopacy had now existed in Scotland for about three years, but it had not got on well. The old tree taken up by the roots and planted again did not seem to thrive; its fibres had been mangled and curtailed, and it did not take with the soil, now too poor for its proper luxuriance of growth. The Church had already appointed a committee to draw up a new scheme of policy, but it was uncertain what they might recommend, when John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, sounded the first note of war against Episcopacy. In the Assembly of August 1575, when the court was about to proceed to the trial of the bishops, he protested that this would not prejudge the objections which he and others entertained to the name and office of a bishop.[2] At a subsequent session of the same Assembly, the question was proposed—Whether bishops, as they are now in Scotland, have their function in the Word of God, and whether the chapters appointed for creating them should be tolerated in this Reformed Church? Melville rose and delivered his sentiments in a speech which produced a powerful impression upon the Assembly.[3] His accurate acquaintance with the language of the New Testament; his intimacy with Beza, who was regarded as an oracle in Scotland; his Genevan experiences; besides his native powers of debate, must have made him be listened to with respect. The consequence was, that a committee of six persons was appointed, three to argue the one side, and three to maintain the other, as was the practice at that time in Scotland; and to report the conclusion to which they might come to a future diet of the Assembly. John Craig, James Lawson, and Andrew Melville, were to impugn Episcopacy; George Hay, John Row, and David Lindsay to defend it.[4]

---

[1] James Melville's Diary. M'Crie's Life of Melville.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, August 1575.

[3] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi. Melville's Diary.

[4] This appears to have been copied from the old scholastic method of defending and impugning a given thesis.

At the sixth session the committee gave in their report in writing. They declared that it was their unanimous opinion, that the name "bishop" rightly belonged to every minister who had the charge of a flock; but that out of these some might be chosen to oversee such reasonable districts as might be assigned them beside their own congregations, to appoint ministers, elders, and deacons in destitute places, and to administer discipline, with the consent of the clergy and people.[1] The Assembly approved of the report, and ordained that farther inquiry should be made in regard to that and other matters affecting the policy and discipline of the Church.[2] When the Assembly again met in April 1576, the subject was resumed, and the same conclusions were arrived at; and in the way of following them up, the bishops, who had not yet received any charge, were required by the morrow to condescend upon the congregations which they would take under their pastoral care.[3]

In 1578 the Assembly proceeded a step farther. It declared that bishops should henceforward be called simply by their own names, and not by any titles of honour; and debarred cathedral chapters from proceeding to any election before its next meeting. The next Assembly made this order perpetual. But it was not till 1580 that the last stone of the Episcopal fabric was thrown down. In that year "the whole Assembly of the Kirk, in one voice, found and declared the pretended office of a bishop to be unlawful, having neither foundation nor warrant in the Word of God, and ordained all such persons as brooked the said office to demit the same, as an office to which they were not called by God, and to cease from preaching the Word, or administering the sacraments, till they should be admitted anew by the General Assembly, under pain of excommunication." To carry out this sweeping resolution, synodal assemblies were appointed to be held in the different dioceses to receive the submission of the bishops, and in case of contumacy, to report them to the next Assembly, that they might be put under the bann of the Church.[4] So energetic were their measures that before the next Assembly all the bishops, except five, had sent in their submissions.

The Church had not been able to carry these measures with-

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, August 1575.

[2] James Melville's Diary.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, April 1576.

[4] Book of the Universal Kirk, 1578, 1580.

out opposition. When the Archbishop of Glasgow was required to take upon him the charge of a congregation, he pleaded that he had accepted his bishopric according to the terms of the concordat of Leith; that when he was admitted to it he had taken an oath to the king, and that if he now consented to any changes he might incur the guilt of perjury; that, nevertheless, when residing in Glasgow he would preach there, and when residing in Ayr he would also preach there, in any church which the brethren might agree upon; but he protested that this must not be understood as interfering with his jurisdiction as bishop of the diocese. The Assembly was obliged to content itself with this.[1] Upon the death of Douglas, Adamson abandoned the Presbyterian cause, and received the presentation to the Archbishopric of St Andrews from the regent. He was instantly brought before the Assembly, but he managed to temporise. The Assembly prohibited the chapter from proceeding to his admission; the regent ordered it to proceed; and proceed it did. The Assembly appointed a commission to summon Adamson before them, and inquire into the case, but it is probable they felt themselves without power to proceed farther, as we do not hear any more of the matter.

As the Regent Morton had been the chief deviser of the tulchan Episcopacy, he was naturally annoyed at the attempts of the Church to overturn it. He was frequently pressed to be present at the Assemblies, but he steadily refused, and attempted to intimidate its leaders by threatening to hang some of them, as an example to the rest.[2] Failing to gain Melville by bribes, he bitterly upbraided him for disturbing the peace of the country by his over-sea dreams and Genevese discipline. "There never will be quietness in this country," said he fiercely, "till half a dozen of you be hanged or banished." "Tush!" said Melville, who had now become Principal of St Mary's College, St Andrews; "threaten your courtiers in that way; it is all the same to me whether I rot in the air or the ground. The earth is the Lord's: my fatherland is wherever well-doing is. I have been ready to give my life, where it would not have been half so well spent, at the pleasure of my God. I lived out of your country ten years as well as in it. Let God be glorified; it is out of your power to hang or exile His truth."[3]

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk.

[2] Melville's Diary, pp. 46, 47, Ban. Ed.

[3] Melville's Diary, pp. 52, 53.

On the 12th of March 1578, the Earl of Morton, finding that his regency had become unpopular, and that it was no longer safe to hold it, resigned it; and the king, a boy twelve years of age, nominally assumed the government. For a little while, Morton had no influence at court; but in less than a year he was again in power, not as regent, but as the adviser of the boy-king. His influence is apparent in a letter which James directed to the Assembly in July 1579, counselling them to make no innovations in the government of the Church during his minority; but the Assembly paid no attention to the advice, and proceeded in their course.[1] In 1580 the triumph of Presbytery was almost complete: Episcopacy had been condemned; the bishops had bowed their heads before the victorious presbyters; but they had bowed them only as the bulrush bows its head under the wave, to lift it up again when it has rolled past.

This ecclesiastical revolution, accomplished by the Church courts in opposition to the wishes of the government, is, in a great measure, to be attributed to the energy and ability of Andrew Melville. He was more learned than his brethren, and had the power which knowledge gives. It is probable there were not ten ministers in the Assembly at this period who could read the New Testament in the original tongue;[2] but Melville was well versed both in Hebrew and Grecian literature, and could prove that, in apostolic times, the bishop and presbyter was one and the same. He received material aid, however, from Theodore Beza. The Earl of Glammis had written to this theological dictator, requesting his opinion upon some of the points which were then so fiercely controverted in

---

[1] Calderwood's History, 1579.

[2] "I wald haiff glaidlie bein at the Greik and Hebrew toungs, becauss I red in our byble that it was translated out of Hebrew and Greik; but the langages were nocht to be gottine in the land. Our Regent begoud and teatched us the A, B, C of the Greik, and the simple declinationes, but went no farther. Be that occasion he tauld me of my uncle, Mr Andro Melville, whom he knew in the tyme of his course in the New Collage, to use the Greik logicks of Aristotle, the quhilk was a wonder to them that he was sa fyne a schollar, and of sic expectation." "Within the University of St Andros, all that was teatched of Aristotle he lerned and studeit out of the Greik text, quhilk his maisters understood nocht." (Melville's Diary, pp. 24, 31.) In March 1575, the Assembly resolved, for the first time, that Latin was a necessary qualification for the ministry. (Book of Universal Kirk.) Row, in his notice of Patrick Simpson, at the end of his History, remarks, that in those days it was a proverb, "Græcum est, non legitur." (History, &c., Coronis, p. 422.)

Scotland. Beza, in answer, published his book "De Triplici Episcopatu"—the divine, human, and Satanic. In this treatise he argues that, unless human Episcopacy be pulled up clean by the roots, it will sprout, and bring forth again, as it had done before, a Satanic Episcopacy.[1] The book was brought over to this country, translated into English, and had some influence upon the contest.

The Church, in 1580, reverted to the policy of 1560. It went farther. Knox held Episcopacy to be lawful, but not convenient,—an allowable form of government, but not the purest or the best. Melville held Episcopacy to be unlawful—opposed to Scripture—allowable in no circumstances. Even the superintendents began to be regarded with suspicion; and preparation was made for the abolition of the order, and the establishment of a perfect parity among all the ministers of the Church. The course which the Church had pursued was a self-denying one. Almost every act of Assembly was a self-denying ordinance. They were offered bishoprics, and they refused them; titles of honour, and they refused them; seats in the parliament as the highest Estate, and seats on the bench as the supreme tribunal, and they refused them. They would be nothing but ministers, with little honour and less pay.

For several years a committee of the Church had been employed in framing a new policy. Many meetings were held, much labour was bestowed, and an ecclesiastical system elaborated, now known as the "Second Book of Discipline." Conferences had also been held with the Privy Council, with the regent, and with the king, to get the consent of the State to the proposed government of the Church; but that consent had hitherto been withheld. In a conference at Stirling, between a committee of the parliament and the Commissioners of the Church, the treatise was gone over article by article; some were marked as agreed to, others as referred to farther reasoning, others as passed over; and more than this the Assembly could not obtain.[2] But now, when the Episcopal polity was destroyed, it was necessary that another should be substituted in its place; and therefore the Assembly which met in April 1581 resolved that "the Book of Policy agreed upon in diverse Assemblies before should be registered in the acts of the Kirk, and remain therein, *ad perpetuam rei memo-*

---

[1] Calderwood's History.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi.

riam, and that a copy thereof should be taken by every presbytery."[1]

It is necessary to give a sketch of this celebrated treatise. In the first chapter the Church is defined, and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions discriminated. The Church, it is said, may mean all who profess the gospel; or, all who are truly godly; or, those who exercise spiritual functions. The ecclesiastical and civil power both flow from God, but cannot in general be exercised by the same person. "The magistrate ought neither to preach, minister the sacraments, nor execute the censures of the Church, nor yet prescribe any rule how it should be done, but command the minister to observe the rule prescribed in the Word, and punish transgressors by civil means; the minister, again, exercises not the civil jurisdiction, but teaches the magistrate how it should be exercised according to the Word." The second chapter is occupied with the office-bearers of the Church. Ecclesiastical functions are divided into ordinary and extraordinary. "There are four ordinary offices or functions in the Church of God—the pastor, minister, or bishop; the doctor; the presbyter or elder; and the deacon. These, we are told, ought to remain perpetually in the Church, as necessary to its government. The third chapter prescribes the manner in which persons were to be admitted to ecclesiastical functions. Calling, it is said, consists of two parts, election and ordination. "Election is the choosing out of one man or person to the office that is void, by the judgment of the eldership and consent of the congregation." "Ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed by God and His Church, after that he is well tried and found qualified." "The ceremonies of ordination are fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands of the eldership." In the fourth chapter, the office and duty of the pastor are defined. Pastor, minister, bishop, are declared to be but different names for the same office. To the pastor it belongs to preach the Word, administer the sacraments, solemnize marriage, and pronounce the denunciations and blessings of the Church. The fifth chapter relates to doctors and schools. "The office of the doctor is to open up the mind of the Spirit of God in the Scriptures simply, without such application as the minister uses." "Under the name and office of doctor is also comprehended the order in schools, colleges, and universities." If the doctor be an elder, he is to assist in the

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, April 1581.

government of the Church; but he is not to preach or administer the sacraments. The sixth chapter is of elders and their office. Elder in Scripture sometimes signifies all who hold office in the Church; but here we are told it is used in a more restricted signification, to denominate those who are to assist the pastors in the government of the flock. "As the pastors and doctors should be diligent in teaching and sowing the seed of the Word, so the elders should be careful in seeking the fruits of the same among the people." "Their principal office is to hold assemblies with the pastors and doctors, who are also of their number, for establishing good order and execution of discipline."

The seventh chapter is an important one, and refers to the assemblies of the Church. "Assemblies are" said to be "of four sorts, for either they are of a particular congregation, or of a province, or of a whole nation, or of all and divers Christian nations." "The first sort and kind of assemblies, although they be within particular congregations, yet they exercise the power, authority, and jurisdiction of the Church with mutual consent." "When we speak of elderships of particular congregations, we mean not that every particular church can and may have their particular elderships, especially to landward; but we think three or four, more or fewer, particular churches may have a common eldership to them all, to judge their ecclesiastical causes." "Provincial assemblies we call lawful conventions of the pastors, doctors, and other elders of any province, gathered for the common affairs of the churches thereof." "The national Assembly, which we call General, is a lawful convention of the whole Church of the realm or nation where it is gathered, and may be called the General Eldership of the whole Church within the realm." "There is besides these another more General Assembly, which is of all nations, and of all estates of persons within the Church, representing the universal Church of Christ, which may be properly called the General Assembly, or General Council of the whole Church of God."

In the eighth chapter the office of the deacons is discussed. To them belongs the collection and distribution of the ecclesiastical property; and in this they must be subject to the presbytery, though they are not members of it. The ninth chapter treats of the patrimony of the Church. To appropriate any portion of this is declared to be detestable sacrilege; —it ought to be lifted by the deacons, and applied to ecclesi-

astical uses. The tenth chapter points out the duty of the magistrate in relation to the Church. He is to defend it, provide for it, see its sentences carried into execution, but not to invade its inherent jurisdiction. In the eleventh chapter there is a list of abuses, which the Church desired to have reformed. Amongst these are abbacies, cathedral chapters, bishoprics, pluralities, the employment of ecclesiastical persons in civil affairs, the dilapidation of the Church's property, &c., &c. In the twelfth chapter certain things are noted which the Church desired to see done. It desired to see small parishes united, large parishes disjoined, one or more elders appointed in every congregation, congregational, provincial, and national assemblies held, patronage abolished in every case where there was a cure of souls, and the patrimony of the Church applied to four general purposes :—"One part to be assigned to the pastor, for his entertainment and keeping hospitality ; another to the elders, deacons, and other officers of the Church, as clerks of assemblies, takers up of Psalms, beadles, and keepers of the Church so far as they are necessary, joining therewith the doctors of schools, for help of the old foundations, where need requires ; the third portion to be bestowed upon the poor members of Christ ; and the fourth upon the reparation of Churches, and other extraordinary charges that are profitable to the Church and commonwealth." The concluding chapter points out the good that would result from the adoption of such a discipline :—The realm would become a pattern of good order ; the streets would be cleansed of beggars ; churches, bridges, and other public works would be set agoing ; God would be glorified ; the Church edified ; Christ and His kingdom advanced ; Satan and his kingdom subverted ; and God would dwell in the midst of them.

Such are the most prominent features of the "Second Book of Discipline." The First Book exhibited a system of polity sagaciously suited to the circumstances of the country and the Church : it seemed to grow out of the times. The Second aims at elaborating a system from the New Testament, without reference to circumstances. The one looked to practice ; the other looked to the establishment of general principles. They differ in several respects. The "First Book of Discipline" had abolished the imposition of hands in ordination ; the Second restored it. The "First Book of Discipline" gave its sanction to superintendents and readers ; the Second removed the superintendent, as he savoured of the diocesan bishop, and

the reader, as his office had no warrant in the Word of God, however much it might be required by the times. In the "First Book of Discipline" there is no mention whatever of the courts of the Church, though we can trace in some of its arrangements the beginnings of them all; in the Second there is an elaborate chapter upon assemblies, but, singular enough, the presbytery, now reckoned the fundamental court of a Presbyterian Church, is not marked out as a court separate and distinct from the kirk-session. Four ecclesiastical assemblies are named—the congregational, the provincial, the national, and œcumenical. Striking out the œcumenical, we have only a threefold gradation, instead of a fourfold as at present. The first of these, the eldership, or congregational assembly, approximates much more closely to a modern kirk-session than a modern presbytery. In towns, the pastor and elders of one congregation were to form the eldership; but in landward parishes, three or four congregations were to join their pastors and elders together to constitute one assembly. Strange! that the very reverse should now be the case—that in landward parishes every congregation should have its own kirk-session, and that in some towns all the congregations should send their office-bearers to form one general session. Yet we know that at this very time presbyteries were springing into existence. In 1579 the Assembly was petitioned to erect such courts; and its answer was, that the weekly *exercise* might be regarded as a presbytery[1]—a meeting appointed by the "First Book of Discipline" for the purpose of bringing the ministers and people of a district together to read and interpret the Scriptures. But, what is much more remarkable, in the very Assembly in which the "Second Book of Discipline" was ordered to be engrossed in the minutes, a regular platform of presbyteries was arranged—presbyteries embracing not two or three congregations, but twenty or thirty, the very prototypes of the presbyteries which now exist.[2]

Time has made havoc upon the policy established by the "Second Book of Discipline," as upon everything human. The doctor and the deacon have all but disappeared from the

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, 1579.

[2] Ibid., 1581. In 1582, the presbytery was considered a novelty, as the following extract from the Historie of King James the Sext will show:—"It pleasit the members of court to give eare to certayne informations maid aganis a new erectit society of ministers, callit a presbiterie, sa that thair moderators weir summonit to compeir before the king and counsall, to produce the bukis of thair proceidings, to be sene and considerit." Anno 1582, p. 187.

office-bearers of the Church; the minister and the elder alone remain. The kirk-session has been discriminated from the presbytery; and by kirk-sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, the government of the Church is now carried on. But the "Second Book of Discipline" possesses much that is enduring, and to this day remains the foundation-stone of our ecclesiastical constitution; while the "First Book" resembles a collection of parchments deposited beneath it, by which future generations may read the story of the times in which the building was begun, and the noble designs of its first founders.

It is plain that the superintendents were fast falling into disrepute. The name began to be disliked, and "visitor" was substituted in its place. But even the visitor was now destined to yield up his power to the presbytery. In the Assembly of October 1580, it was considered "to sound to tyrannie that sic kind of office sould stand in the person of ane man, quhilk sould flow from the presbyteries,"[1] and therefore a committee was appointed to draw up a platform of presbyteries and constitutions for them. In the very next Assembly the Laird of Caprington appeared and presented a commission from the king to concur with the Assembly in the planting of churches and presbyteries, and a document containing a number of suggestions as to the course to be pursued. In this document it is stated that, leaving out the Diocese of Argyll and the Isles, from which no returns had yet been obtained, there were in all nine hundred and twenty-four parishes in Scotland. Of these it was said many were mere pendicles, many very small parishes, and of many more the churches were demolished, and therefore it was proposed to reduce the number to six hundred, and to divide these among fifty presbyteries, with about twenty churches attached to each.[2] In its eighth session, the Assembly had before it the report of its committee on the subject, and resolved "that a beginning should be had of presbyteries instantly in the places after named, to be exemplars to the rest that may be established afterwards," viz., Edinburgh, Dundee, St Andrews, Perth, Stirling, Glasgow, Ayr, Irving, Haddington, Linlithgow, Dunbar, Chirnside, and Dunfermline.[3] The thing was done,

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, October 1580.

[2] "Thir six hundred kirks to be divyded in fyftie Presbyteries, twenty to every presbytrie, or thereabout." (Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 212.) So stands the king's scheme, but I cannot understand the royal arithmetic, as 50 × 20 = 1000. Rowsays twelve to each, which makes all right.

[3] Ibid., 1581.

and Scotland now for the first time saw the full machinery of its Presbyterian polity in motion.

We must now leave for a little the divines of the Assembly, and mingle with the statesmen and gallants of the court. In the year 1579, Esmé Stewart, a cousin of the young king, and generally called Mons. D'Aubigné, arrived from France on a visit to his royal relative. He was a young man of graceful exterior and many showy accomplishments, and he was not long at court till he became a prodigious favourite of the king's. Wherever James was, D'Aubigné was sure to be. They rode together, hunted together, hawked together; and when the court was removed to Holyrood, the apartments assigned to D'Aubigné were next to those occupied by the king. It was the first noted instance of a favouritism to which James was all his life long in bondage. Under the smiles of the monarch D'Aubigné grew rapidly into greatness; he was first made Earl, and subsequently Duke of Lennox; he was raised to the office of Lord High Chamberlain; the rich Abbacy of Arbroath was given him; and the greatest nobles courted his favour. About the same time, Captain James Stewart, a younger son of Lord Ochiltree's, also began to acquire influence at court. He was well educated, and had seen a good deal of the world; but in his travels he had lost any little principle he ever had, and was now known to be profligate in his manners and reckless of results, if but his own interests were advanced. He was created Earl of Arran, under which name we shall hear more of him anon. From the pedagogic birch of Buchanan, and the stern admonitions of Morton, the king, now a lad of fourteen, passed into the hands of these gay companions and counsellors.

The ministers of the Church beheld all this with alarm. D'Aubigné was a Papist. It was whispered that he had come to this country as a secret emissary of the Pope. It was known that before leaving France he had had consultations with the Bishops of Glasgow and Ross; and it was told how the Duke of Guise had accompanied him to Dieppe, and remained on board ship with him some hours before he set sail. There were other rumours afloat of Jesuit priests having stolen into the country; of plots to bring back a Popish queen; of endeavours to break the alliance with England, and revert to the ancient alliance with France; and as the danger was unseen, every one magnified it according to his fears. D'Aubigné partly, and only partly, allayed the

alarm, by declaring his conversion to Protestantism. The young king, already vain of his theological acquirements, had plied him with arguments; he had called in some Presbyterian clergymen to his help, and the favourite could not withstand the logic of the monarch and his ministers. He publicly renounced and abjured the Romish faith in the Church of St Gile's at Edinburgh, in the Royal Chapel at Stirling, and last of all, in a letter to the General Assembly.[1] Still the popular mind was ill at ease in regard to Popery. To still suspicion, rather than to test the orthodoxy of the country, the king caused Craig to draw up a confession of faith, or covenant condemnatory of all the most obnoxious tenets of the Romish religion. When drawn, it was signed by the king and his household, and afterwards, in consequence of an order of the Privy Council and an act of the Assembly, by persons of all ranks throughout the kingdom. In opposition to the Confession of 1560, it was called the Negative Confession, as it related rather to doctrines which were not believed, than to those which were.[2]

It was not to be expected that the ex-regent Morton would look on with indifference while the upstart Lennox enjoyed all the favour of the king, and wielded all the power of the country. He had lost the good opinions of the clergy and the people by his greed, his Simony, and his tulchan Episcopacy; but he caballed with Elizabeth, and Elizabeth was glad to have the aid of so powerful and crafty a man, for she began to dread the re-ascendancy of French influence in Scotland.[3] There was a bitter jealousy between the rivals, continual rumours of plots and counter-plots, and it was evident that Scotland could not hold them both. Lennox struck the first blow, and secured the victory. One day, while the Council was sitting, Captain Stewart begged permission to enter, and going down upon his knee before the king, he accused Morton of being privy to the murder of his father. Morton was sitting at the council-board when the charge was made, but he was at once placed under arrest, and it is highly probable that the whole procedure had been previously arranged with the king. Five months elapsed before

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 196, 197.

[2] This Confession, forming the first part of The National Covenant or Confession of Faith, is generally bound up in the same volume with the Westminster Confession.

[3] Tytler's History, vol. viii.

he was brought to trial, and then the proof would have failed, had he not himself confessed that he had previous knowledge of the intended assassination, though he took no part in its execution.

On this confession he was condemned to die. He had reached to power by the commission of great crimes, and had kept it by the exercise of great severity. He had never hesitated to send his enemies to the scaffold;[1] but now, when his own turn came, he showed that he could go thither too, and die, if not with the serenity of a martyr, at least with the firmness of a man. On the evening of Friday, the 2d of June 1581, some men might be seen digging a grave in the Tolbooth burying-ground, and depositing in it a headless trunk. It was the great Earl of Morton, who had so long kept the country in terror, and had that day perished under the knife of the maiden, who was thus so meanly interred.[2] His ghastly head was exposed on the gable of the church.

The death of Morton left Lennox supreme. But it was felt more than ever that his power was dangerous to the State—dangerous to the Church. Events were already ripening for a conflict. James appears to have early contracted a partiality for the Episcopal polity. He was still a boy; but he was a marvellously precocious boy, and perhaps nearly as wise now as at any future period of his life, for he was only a clever school-boy to the last. What was the origin of his Episcopal tendencies it is difficult to discover. Notwithstanding his being reared amid revolutionary nobles, and tutored by a republican pedagogue, he had contracted overweening ideas of hereditary and indefeasible prerogative. Even a dull boy might see that Presbytery was essentially democratic. Perhaps James had actually seen that the bishops were courtly, smooth-spoken gentlemen, while the ministers were rough, outspoken men. Be this as it may, notwithstanding the resolutions of the Assembly, he determined to maintain Episcopacy; and of course the favourite agreed with

---

[1] As instances of this, two poets had lampooned him;—he hanged them both. The following notice occurs in the Diurnal of Occurrents, 1572:—"*21st April.*—The same day there was a minister hanged in Leith, and borne to the gibbet, because he was *birsit* in the boots. The principal cause was that he said to the Earl of Morton that he defended an unjust cause, and that he would repent when there was no time to repent. And when he was asked by whom he was requested to say the same, he answered, 'By the Holy Spirit.'"

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi.

the king—if it was not the king who agreed with the favourite. While things were in this state, the Archbishopric of Glasgow became vacant by the death of Boyd; and Lennox, who held in his hands the patronage of the kingdom, had it at his disposal. He offered it to Montgomery, the minister of Stirling, upon condition that, so soon as he was admitted, he would dispone the lands, lordships, and everything belonging to the bishopric to him and his heirs, for the yearly payment of £1000 Scots, with some horse-corn and poultry. Montgomery accepted the offer, and the conflict with the Church began.[1]

The matter was brought before the Assembly, which met in October 1581. One would have imagined that the bishop-elect would have been charged with accepting an office which had been declared unlawful by the courts of the Church, or for entering into a Simoniacal paction with the patron; but not so. Melville appeared as his accuser; and though his libel contained fifteen articles, there was not the slightest reference to the real head and front of Montgomery's offending. This was a tortuous policy, and such as we would not have expected from so bold a man. It was worse, for it is a perversion of justice to accuse a man of one crime and condemn him for another. The articles did not charge immorality, and related principally to sentiments which Montgomery was said to have uttered in the pulpit, and which would not now be considered as deserving of very serious censure. Though proof was ordered, it does not seem to have been led, for commission was given to the Presbytery of Stirling to summon him before them, try his whole life and doctrine, and report to the provincial Synod of Lothian. He was ordered, in the meantime, to continue in his ministry at Stirling, and not to aspire to the Bishopric of Glasgow, under pain of excommunication.[2]

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi. Calderwood says £500. The value of the bishopric was £4080, 13s. 4d. See the Appendix to Keith's History.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, October 1581. Calderwood's History, same date.

The charges in the libel are curious; for instance:—"1. That, publicly preaching in the church of Stirling, he propounded a question touching the circumcision of women, and in the end concluded that they were circumcised in the skin of their foreheads. 2. In Glasgow he openly taught that the discipline of the Kirk (*i.e.*, its polity) is a thing indifferent, and may stand this way or that. 3. He accused the ministers that they used fallacious arguments and captions, and that they were

A.D. 1582. Montgomery ventured to defy the thunders of the Church. In the month of March of the following year he proceeded to Glasgow, attended by an armed escort, and entered the cathedral. The minister had already occupied the pulpit. The bishop-elect pulled him by the sleeve, and said, "Come down, sirrah!" but the minister kept his ground. There was like to be a tumult, and Montgomery was constrained to retire. The Presbytery of Stirling at once suspended him from the office of the ministry; but he disregarded their sentence. The Privy Council now interfered, and summoned the Presbyteries of Glasgow, Stirling, Dalkeith, Linlithgow, and Edinburgh, to appear and answer for their conduct in regard to Montgomery. They declined the jurisdiction of the Council. The Church and the State had come into violent collision.[1] In April the General Assembly met, and the whole matter was brought before it. More specific and more serious charges were now brought against Montgomery, such as lying in the face of the Church courts, and despising their sentences. The king, anxious to save his bishop, had already sent a message to the Assembly, requesting that they would not trouble him in regard to his bishopric; but the Assembly pursued its course notwithstanding. James now proceeded farther: a messenger-at-arms entered the House, and by virtue of the King's letters, delivered by the Lords of Secret Council, inhibited the Assembly from citing, excommunicating, or otherwise troubling Montgomery in the matter of the episcopate, under pain of rebellion. The Assembly directed a letter to his Majesty, vindicating the course they were pursuing; and having done so, they were about to proceed to the final sentence of ecclesiastical law, excommunication—"to the effect that Montgomery's proud flesh be cast into the hands of Satan; if he may be won again, if it be possible, to God"—when he yielded, confessed his faults, and promised to give up all thoughts of the bishopric. The Assembly received his submission, but at the same time instructed the Presbytery of Glasgow to keep a watch upon his conduct.[2]

---

curious brains. 4. So far as he could, he travelled to bring the original languages, Greek and Hebrew, into contempt, abusing thereto the words of the Apostle, 1 Cor. xiv., and tauntingly asked in what school were Peter and Paul graduated," &c., &c.

[1] Calderwood's History, 1582.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 245-48. Calderwood's History, 1582.

There was need for the caution. Probably incited by the king and the court, Montgomery began to preach and to revive his claims upon the archbishopric. The Presbytery of Glasgow instantly met; but this had been anticipated, and the Council was equally prompt. While the ecclesiastical court was yet sitting, the provost, bailies, and some citizens entered, prohibited them from proceeding, and cited them to appear before the Privy Council. The presbytery refused; the magistrates "put violent hands upon the moderator, smote him in the face, rent his beard, struck out one of his teeth, and thereafter committed him to ward in the Tolbooth."[1] The students interfered; some fighting took place; a serious tumult was apprehended; and by tuck of drum and sound of bell, the citizens were collected to defend their bailies. But the presbytery kept to their point, and sentence was pronounced against Montgomery, and forwarded to the Presbytery of Edinburgh. On Saturday, the 9th of June, the Presbytery of Edinburgh met, and appointed John Davidson, minister of Libberton, to pronounce the sentence of excommunication against Montgomery, which Davidson did on the following day.[2]

The meeting of Assembly was hastened. It convened on the 27th of June. Melville preached the opening sermon, and inveighed against the "*bludie gullie*[3] of absolute authority, whereby many intended to pull the crown off Christ's head, and to wring the sceptre out of His hands."[4] The Church resolved to lay its griefs at the foot of the throne. A committee was accordingly appointed to proceed to Perth, where the king then was. They procured an audience, and produced their complaints, which related chiefly to the interference of the Council with the ecclesiastical courts in the exercise of their jurisdiction. "Who dare subscribe these treasonable articles?" said the Earl of Arran, and the Earl of Arran was not a man to be trifled with. "WE DARE," said Andrew Melville, "and will subscribe, and render our lives in the cause." Stepping forward to the table, he took the pen from the clerk, and wrote his name; the rest followed.[5] The king and his counsellors might have learned from this what was the temper of the men they had to deal with.

---

[1] Calderwood's History, 1582.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 256-58. Calderwood's History.

[3] Bloody knife.

[4] Calderwood's History.

[5] Melville's Diary. Calderwood's History.

Lennox and Arran were so confounded that they thought they had some armed force at their back. The truth is they had the whole nation at their back. They were dismissed with a peaceful reply, but still it was not one with which the Assembly was satisfied.

The din of the contest extended beyond the courts of the Church. The pulpits rang with it. The excitement of the period was increased by continual rumours of French intrigues, of Popish plots, and of seminary priests and Jesuits having been smuggled into the country. James complained to the Assembly that Balcanquhal one of the ministers of Edinburgh, had, in a sermon, accused his cousin the Duke of Lennox of labouring to restore Popery.[1] The Assembly asked the king to condescend upon a proof of his statement; and, as he declined to do so, it absolved Balcanquhal. Durie, another of the Edinburgh ministers, was still more outspoken. He declared from the pulpit that James had been moved by his courtiers to send a private message to the King of France and the Duke of Guise, to ask his mother's blessing, and was scheming to place her beside him on the throne. At the nick of time a certain Signor Paul came from the Duke of Guise to present some horses to his Majesty. It was instantly suspected that he had other business on hand, and the story went that this very man had been one of the butchers of St Bartholomew's day. The zealous Durie took to horse and rode to Kinneil, where the king was. Meeting Paul in the garden, he drew his hat over his eyes, saying, he could not look upon the devil's ambassador. Getting admission to the monarch, "Is it with the Guise," cried he, "that your Grace will exchange presents,—with that cruel murderer of the saints?" Returning to Edinburgh, he made the High Church to resound with his fiery eloquence. He denounced Montgomery as an apostate and man-sworn traitor to God and his Church. Passing on to the Guisean embassage, he exclaimed, "If God did threaten the captivity and spoil of Jerusalem because that their king Hezekiah did receive a letter and present from the king of Babylon, shall we think to be free, committing the like, or rather worse?"[2] His sermon excited considerable stir, and

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, 1582.

[2] Tytler's History, vol. viii. Calderwood's History. Tytler, in his Appendix, gives a sketch of this sermon from the pen of one of the auditors.

he was cited before the Council to answer for it. When he arrived at Dalkeith Palace, where the king was residing with Lennox, his Grace's cooks, zealous to avenge their master upon his reviler, issued from the kitchen with spits and knives, and had nearly elevated Durie to the honour of a second St Lawrence.[1] He escaped this culinary martyrdom; but he was ordered to leave the city, and the provost and magistrates were instructed to see the sentence carried into execution.

Durie asked the advice of the Assembly as to what he should do. The magistrates asked the advice of the Assembly too, for they were members of Durie's congregation, and were divided between their allegiance to the kirk and their allegiance to the king. The Assembly pronounced Durie's doctrine sound, and his life honest, and advised him not to quit the city unless he were forced, but if he were forced, to go peaceably.[2] The magistrates were reluctantly compelled to insist upon his leaving. That same night, about nine o'clock, he was seen taking his way along the High Street, accompanied by two notaries and a few of his brethren. When they came to the cross, one of the notaries read a document, in which the exiled minister protested the purity of his life and doctrine, and that, though he obeyed the sentence of banishment, he would not desist from preaching the Word. According to legal form, he then placed a piece of money in the hands of the notaries, and took instruments. "I, too," cried Davidson, who was with him, "must take instruments, and this I protest is the most sorrowful sight that eyes ever rested upon—a shepherd removed by his own flock to pleasure flesh and blood, and because he has spoken the truth. But plague and fearful judgments will yet light on the inventors."[3]

The Church was nothing daunted by the exile of Durie. If the king wielded the sword, it wielded the keys—still the

---

[1] James Melville's Diary.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 252, 253. Calderwood's History.

[3] Tytler's History, vol. viii. Calderwood's History. Anciently, in Scotland, taking instruments in the hands of a notary was very common. A curious instance of this is given in Mill's History of the Bishops of Dunkeld. One of these old prelates lying on his death-bed, having professed his faith, and received the sacraments of the Church, afraid lest in delirium or extreme weakness he might say things contradictory of his Christian profession, called in a notary and took instruments, that whatever he might say after that was not to be esteemed of any weight or authority.

more formidable weapon of the two. The provost and bailies of Glasgow had assaulted a presbytery, and done violence to its moderator; they were summoned before the Assembly, threatened with excommunication, and glad to save themselves by making an abject submission. The Lord Advocate, in the discharge of his duty, had penned some proclamations, which were esteemed slanderous to the Church. He was cited to appear at its bar, and he hardly escaped by humbly protesting that he had only translated into Scotch what had already been written by Lennox in French.[1] Montgomery had already been excommunicated, but Lennox had harboured him, and it was against the ecclesiastical code to harbour an excommunicated man. The uncompromising presbyters threatened "to take order" with the duke, the Lord High Chamberlain of the kingdom, the cousin of the king; for their lightnings could strike the tops of the highest hills. James Montgomerie, probably a relative of the excommunicated bishop, had spoken to him, and to speak to an excommunicated man was a high misdemeanour. He was ordered to make public repentance in the parish church of Glasgow.[2] The excommunicated man himself ventured to appear in the streets of Edinburgh, and this also was a crime. Lawson applied to the magistrates, and he was compelled to sneak away. The Council tried to save him, by making proclamation that he should be received as a true Christian and faithful subject; but the Church was stronger than the Council. He returned to the town, and presented himself at the Tolbooth, but he was refused admittance within the bar, and told that no excommunicated man could appear as a pursuer. The magistrates and officers were immediately upon his track, and again insisted upon his leaving the town. While this was going on within, a crowd had collected in the street, and were impatiently waiting for him to come out—some with sticks, some with stones, some with rotten eggs. To have surrendered him to the people might have cost him his life, and so he was quietly smuggled away by the Kirk Heugh; but the mob got the scent, and were soon in full cry after him, and he did not escape from the city by the Potterrow gate without receiving some smart slaps upon the back. The king was at Perth when this scene took place, and when he heard of it he could only throw himself down

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, June and October 1582.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, October 1582.

upon the Inch, and give way to roars of laughter.[1] His sense of the ludicrous got the better of his sense of justice.

On the 23d of August 1582, the king suddenly found himself a prisoner at Huntingtower, a castle in the neighbourhood of Perth, belonging to the Earl of Gowrie. Scotland for centuries had been fated to have children to rule over it, and its nobles had learned that the faction who possessed the royal child were generally able to exercise the royal power. The Earls of Gowrie, Mar, Glammis, and some others, had beheld with impatience the upstarts Lennox and Arran sharing between them the smiles of the monarch and the government of the country, and encouraged by Elizabeth, that old fomenter of sedition, and probably alarmed for the Protestant faith, they had signed a bond which pledged them to drive Lennox from the court. As chance would have it, the king came to the neighbourhood of Perth to hunt, just when the conspiracy was nearly ripe. The opportunity was not to be lost; he was decoyed to the castle of the Ruthvens; and when he wished to depart, Glammis placed himself against the door, and informed him he was their captive. The Earl of Arran was shortly afterwards seized and confined in Duplin; the king was removed to Stirling; and Lennox got warning that he would do well to leave the country without delay.

The ministers regarded the Raid of Ruthven as the deliverance of the Church from an evil bondage, and many of them proclaimed their satisfaction from the pulpit. Others of them entered into treaty with the Confederated Lords. The exiled Durie was brought back to Edinburgh amidst the shouts of the citizens and the singing of psalms, and Lennox, who beheld the triumphal procession from a window, is said to have torn his beard with rage, and immediately to have fled to Dumbarton, from which he afterwards escaped to France.[2] The Confederates knew that their cause would gain strength if it received the sanction of the Church; and therefore, when the Assembly met in October, Lord Paisley appeared as their commissioner, declared that their reasons for undertaking the enterprise were the dangers which threatened the Church, the king, and the commonwealth, and beseeched them to show their "good liking to it," and to appoint each minister in his own pulpit to explain the nature of it to his people, and ex-

---

[1] Tytler's History, vol. viii. Calderwood's History, 1582.

[2] Melville's Diary. Calderwood, 1582. Burton, ch. lviii. The Psalm sung was the well known 124th.

hort them to give it their concurrence. The Assembly at once resolved that the dangers alluded to existed; but before proceeding farther, they sent a deputation to wait upon the king and learn his mind upon the matter. The king was a captive, and required to speak as his jailors dictated; he confessed the Church and commonwealth were in danger. When the deputation returned, the whole Assembly with one voice declared their approbation of the Raid, and ordained an act to be made accordingly.[1]

On the 28th September 1582, while the excitement of the Ruthven enterprise was still fresh, George Buchanan, the most illustrious of living Scotchmen, breathed his last. Born in the parish of Killearn in 1506, he became early conspicuous for his talents, and his uncle, James Heriot, sent him to Paris to complete his education. But James Heriot died, and the Scotch scholar was left in poverty. He came back to Scotland; he struggled with bad health; he went into the army; he returned to his scholastic studies; and the summer of 1526 found him a second time in France. After several years he was once more in his native country, and acted for a time as tutor to James Stewart, afterwards the celebrated regent, and was probably the first to imbue his mind with a love for Lutheranism. Buchanan's religious opinions at this time were necessarily secret, but James V. knew he had no love for the monks, and employed him to write a satire upon the Franciscans; and the poem was felt to be so cutting, that the poet was glad to escape with his life. Probably the king felt that he could not openly protect him. He sought an asylum in France, a country which he loved, and which appears to have always paid a willing homage to his genius. He taught in Bordeaux for a time; he afterwards taught in Portugal; but suspicions arose in regard to his orthodoxy, and he was accused of heresy and imprisoned in a monastery. Christendom will pardon the Portuguese monks their persecution, when it is known that it was to relieve the solitude of his monastic prison that Buchanan translated the Psalter into Latin verse, in which the piety of the Hebrew bards is embalmed in the aromatic diction of the Augustan age. Set at liberty, he remained for a time in Portugal, and received some flattering attentions from the king. After this we find him in England, in France, in Italy, illustrating the mediæval description of our countrymen—*Scoti vagantes*. About 1560 he returned to Scotland to leave it no more.

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, October 1582.

Two years afterwards, Queen Mary came, having already buried in France her hopes and her happiness. Buchanan was employed to assist her in her classical studies; for ladies of fashion in those days, having no Shakespeare, Scott, or Macaulay to read, read the epics of Homer, the odes of Horace, and the grand historic fictions of Livy. Buchanan showed his admiration for his royal mistress by dedicating to her the first complete edition of his "Psalms:" Mary showed her appreciation of her scholarly tutor by making him Commendator of Crossraguel. But Buchanan was a Protestant in religion, and a republican in politics; and these principles naturally leagued him with the opponents of Mary's government. The Earl of Moray presented him to the Principality of St Leonard's College. The General Assembly received lustre from his constant attendance, and honoured itself as much as it honoured him by elevating him, though a layman, to the Moderator's chair. When Mary was driven from her throne, to Buchanan was entrusted the education of the infant king—a trust which he discharged faithfully and well. He made James a scholar; he could not make him more. He raised a wondrous crop of learning upon a thin, though sharp, soil. To his royal pupil he dedicated his famous treatise, "De jure Regni apud Scotos"—a treatise in which he brought back from heaven the old altar-flame of civil and religious liberty, quenched upon earth since the days of republican Greece and consular Rome.

His last great work was the history of his country. A keen partisan in an age torn with contending factions, it was not to be expected that he should speak of his contemporaries with impartiality; but still his history will ever stand a noble monument of his industry and scholarship. He only lived long enough to complete it. A short time before his death, Andrew and James Melville went to Edinburgh to visit him. They found him in his bedroom, sitting in his chair, and "teaching his young man that servit him in his chalmer to spell a-b, ab; e-b, eb." "I see, sir," said Andrew Melville, "you are not idle." "Better this," replied the veteran scholar, "than stealing sheep, or sitting idle, which is as bad;"—a lesson which his Celtic brethren on the banks of Lochlomond required two centuries longer to learn. Buchanan dismissed his pupil, and showed Melville his "Epistle Dedicatory to the King." Melville ventured some criticisms. "I can do no more," replied the feeble old man, "for thinking of another matter."

"What is that?" said Melville. "To die!" said Buchanan.[1] The change for which he was preparing came, and he died so poor that he was buried at the public expense. His grave was made in the Greyfriars Church-yard, and a plain stone placed at the head of it; but no one can now point out the spot.

While the king was in the hands of the Gowrie conspirators, an embassage arrived from France, at the head of which were De Menainville and De la Motte Fenelon. The ministers withstood their being received at court; but the king, after debating the matter with a deputation of them, determined otherwise. The ambassadors demanded the use of the mass, which was allowed them; and this also excited popular discontent. Fenelon was a knight of the order of the Holy Spirit, and wore a white cross embroidered on his shoulder. This was denominated a badge of Antichrist; and the ambassador of the Catholic King was followed wherever he went by the hootings of the Edinburgh mob.[2] When he was about to leave the country, James requested the magistrates of the metropolis to entertain him at a civic banquet; the ministers, scandalized that such an honour should be paid to such a man, proclaimed a fast upon the same day. While the bailies were pledging the envoys in their cups, the preachers were thundering anathemas at their head in the Church of St Gile's. On the same day the city presented the twofold aspect of a house of mourning and a house of feasting.[3] Upon the whole, the preachers and people were right, for the thrill of horror which darted through Europe with the intelligence of St Bartholomew's massacre was not yet forgotten, nor was it right that it should.

On the 25th of June 1583, James managed to escape from his keepers, and threw himself into the Castle of St Andrews. The power of the Confederate Lords was at an end. The king published a proclamation, declaring the Raid of Ruthven to be treason, but at the same time holding out the promise of a pardon to all who should acknowledge their crime. The barons made their submission, and were forgiven; but the Church could not thus easily cancel its own solemn deeds.

---

[1] James Melville's Diary. Buchanan's life has been written with much judgment and taste by Dr Irving.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi Historie of King James VI., Ban. Club Ed.

[3] Historie of King James Sext. Spottiswood. Calderwood, &c.

The clergy, in fact, did not feel themselves called upon to do so; for they still thought that the evils of the government had required such a remedy, and several of them did not hesitate to say so in the pulpit. With Arran in power, such speeches could scarcely pass with impunity. Durie was cited before the Council, but retracted, and was dismissed. Andrew Melville was cited for using still stronger language, holding out to the king the fearful examples of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and James III., and he would not retract.[1] He acknowledged what he said, but declined the judgment of the Council, on the ground that what was spoken in the pulpit ought first to be tried by the Presbytery, and that neither the king nor Council might, in the first instance meddle with it, though the speeches were treasonable. Few men will now defend the declinature of Melville: modern sense and modern legislation have decided against it. But every accused man should be allowed the liberty of urging every possible plea which he chooses; and the absurdity of the plea should not be held as aggravating the crime. There is reason to think that, in this case, the plea was held as an aggravation of the offence. But there is also reason to suspect that Melville so far forgot himself as to be contemptuous to the court before which he was arraigned. "That you may see your weakness and rashness," cried he to the king and his counsellors in the course of the trial, "in taking upon you what you neither can nor ought to do, *these* are my instructions; see if any of you can judge of them, or show that I have passed my injunctions;" and with that he unclasped a Hebrew Bible from his girdle, and clanked it down upon the table.[2] The records of the Privy Council bear that he declared "proudly, irreverently, and contemptuously, that the laws of God and the practices observed within this country were perverted, and not observed, in his case."[3] Would such language be permitted in the present day? Would such a proud speaker not be imprisoned for contempt of court, though for nothing else? Melville was ordered to enter himself a prisoner in Blackness Castle within ten hours; but some of his friends repeated to him the Angus proverb, "Loose and living;"—he took the hint, and fled to Berwick.[4]

A.D. 1584. Melville was followed in his flight by several of his brethren, who had reason to dread the

---

[1] M'Crie's Life of Melville. Melville's Diary. Calderwood's History.
[2] James Melville's Diary.
[3] M'Crie's Life of Melville.
[4] James Melville's Diary.

displeasure of the king. They were not well gone till Gowrie was brought to trial, for a new conspiracy in which he was supposed to have been implicated, and condemned to death. He was among the last of the turbulent barons who had moved amidst the political storms of the last quarter of a century. They had almost all died by violence. Moray had perished from the bullet of an assassin; Grange had been hanged; Lethington had taken poison; Morton had yielded up life under the axe of the maiden; and now Ruthven was destined to share his fate.

James was bent upon destroying a form of Church government which he imagined to be inconsistent with his own kingly prerogatives. The General Assembly rested upon too popular a basis; it was too independent of his absolute will; it assumed a jurisdiction which he could not allow. The ministers were too much given to discuss political subjects in the pulpit—to speak evil of dignities—to resist the powers that were ordained of God; and therefore their liberty must be restrained. James had servants only too ready to assist him in his undertaking. Arran's power was now greater than ever; and he was the known enemy of the Presbyteries. Adamson, the titular Archbishop of St Andrews, was constantly at court, and laboured with all his might to perfect the Episcopal polity of the Church. On the 22d of May 1584, the parliament assembled. Much business was on hand. Some of the greatest nobles in the kingdom were declared guilty of treason, and their estates forfeited to the Crown. But this was the least of it. A series of acts were passed almost entirely subversive of the rights hitherto enjoyed by the Church. By one, the ancient jurisdiction of the Three Estates was ratified, and to speak evil of any one of them was declared to be treason; thus were the bishops hedged about. By another, the king was declared to be supreme in all causes and over all persons, and to decline his judgment was pronounced to be treason; thus was the boldness of such men as Melville to be chastised. By a third, all convocations except those specially licensed by the king, were declared to be unlawful; thus were the courts of the Church to be shorn of their power. By a fourth, the chief jurisdiction of the Church was lodged in the hands of the Episcopal body; for the bishops must now do what the Assemblies and presbyteries had hitherto done. By still another act, it was provided "that none should presume, privately or publicly, in sermons, declamations, or

familiar conferences, to utter any false, untrue, or slanderous speeches, to the reproach of his Majesty or council, or meddle with the affairs of his Highness and Estate, under the pains contained in the acts of parliament made against the makers and reporters of lies."[1]

The passing of these acts carried consternation among the Presbyterian clergy. When the first rumours of what was doing in the parliament reached the city, Lindsay hastened to the palace to remonstrate, but he was seized at the gate and sent off a prisoner to Blackness. When the acts were read at the market-cross, Pont, the minister of St Cuthbert's, and a Senator of the College of Justice, publicly protested against them, and took instruments with all the forms of law. Having done this, he fled together with Balcanquhal to Berwick, which was the city of refuge to the persecuted Presbyterians.[2] The whole of the acts were bad, but the one which lay at the basis of the rest was the one which asserted that the king was supreme in all causes, and over all persons—a proposition which the Church of Scotland has ever contended against with weapons both carnal and spiritual. That he is supreme over all persons is allowed; that he is supreme in all causes is denied. It is maintained, that in matters purely spiritual, the ecclesiastical courts possess an independent jurisdiction, and from them there is no appeal. The maintenance of this principle forms a large part of the Church's history, and has been the source of much of the Church's sufferings. The present generation has witnessed the fierce debates and bitter heart-burnings which this question has generated, and has beheld with grief the unfortunate result in a great national Church rent in twain.

If King James had jurisdiction in all causes as well as over all persons, he was entitled to set up bishops and bid all men bow down before them; he was entitled to interdict Assemblies and presbyteries from meeting without his express permission; he was entitled to stop the mouths of outspoken ministers. But the ministers maintained he had no such jurisdiction; that there is a spiritual kingdom in which potentates lose their power, where Cæsar yields to God. By preaching such doctrines as this, they in fact taught the people

---

[1] Acts of the Scotch Parliament, James VI., May 1584. Spottiswood's History. The same parliament condemned Buchanan's History and his Treatise De jure Regni apud Scotos.

[2] Calderwood's History, 1584. Row's History, &c.

that there was a limit to royal prerogatives; that meetings might be held and matters discussed with which monarchs might not meddle; and thus they paved the way for the principles of civil as well as religious liberty. The acts of 1584 were unquestionably tyrannical, subversive of an existing order of things, carried in the face of the country and the Church. The parliament registered the resolves of the king; for though Scottish barons were turbulent, Scottish parliaments were docile, and seldom thwarted the reigning power. But the people sympathised with the ministers; the acts became known as the black acts; and the struggle between the court and the Church, which lasted with some intermissions for more than a century, was begun. James's jealousy of prerogative—the bane of his family—was the origin of the evil, but unfortunately he found some apology for his legislation in the defence of Melville, the political tracts of some of the preachers, and the acts of the Assembly approving of the Raid of Ruthven.[1]

Popular irritation was greatly increased by the passing of these acts, and the bishops could hardly appear in the streets without being mobbed. They were looked upon as the troublers of Zion; as diseased excrescences on the body of the Church, which must be removed before perfect healthfulness could be restored. After the flight of the Melvilles, Adamson attempted to teach at St Andrews, but the students regarded him with the strongest aversion. Parading round his Episcopal palace, they bade him remember how fatal that See had been to his predecessors.[2] He was glad to leave St Andrews and go to Edinburgh, where his services were required, as the pulpits were silent and the ministers in exile; but even there the Privy Council were obliged to interfere to preserve him from insult.[3] Montgomery, the Archbishop of Glasgow, was perhaps still more odious to the people. When residing in Ayr, he was mobbed by a crowd of women and boys, who heaped upon him the vilest abuse, calling him atheist, dog, schismatic, excommunicate beast, unworthy to live.[4]

But James having got his general principles of Church government established by act of parliament, resolved to make the ministers bow their necks to them. It was not

---

[1] These things were pointedly referred to in the preambles of the acts, and specially quoted by the king afterwards in his defence of them.

[2] Tytler's History, vol. ix. M'Crie's Melville.

[3] M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. i.

[4] Tytler's History, vol. ix.

enough they should be written in the statute-book; the ministers must put their hand to them. In August the Estates again assembled, and an act was made that all ministers, readers, and masters of colleges should appear within forty days, and subscribe the acts concerning the king's jurisdiction over all estates, temporal and spiritual, and promise to submit themselves to the bishops, their ordinaries, under pain of being deprived of their stipends.[1] About the same time Archbishop Adamson was invested by the king with plenary powers to exercise his archiepiscopal jurisdiction in accordance with the recent legislation.[2]

John Craig and some others were known to have denounced the laws. They were summoned before the Council to answer for their conduct, and asked how they dared to find fault with acts of parliament. "We will find fault," said Craig, "with anything repugnant to God's Word." Upon this Arran started to his feet, and fiercely said, that the ministers were too pert, and that he would shave their heads, pair their nails, cut their toes, and make them an example to all that rebelled against the king and his Council. James, however, was less fierce and more politic than his counsellor; and, after some negotiation, he prevailed upon Craig and other influential ministers to sign a deed of submission, adding the clause, "agreeably to the Word of God," to satisfy their consciences.[3]

But neither the fierceness of Arran nor the kingcraft of James could repress altogether the utterance of thought and feeling. Some of the ministers had prayed for their exiled brethren; this was construed into treason. Others had received letters from them; this also was held to be a crime. The fugitives directed a letter to their congregation, explaining and bemoaning the causes of their exile. The magistrates and citizens of Edinburgh, under royal influences, and probably assisted by an archiepiscopal pen, answered the letter, and taunted the ministers with abandoning their flocks, as sheep without a shepherd. The pen-and-ink battle was fairly begun. Pamphlets and "scurril poems" appeared on both sides. Adamson wrote a defence of the acts. James Melville, from his retreat in England, wrote a dissuasive from subscribing them. The wives of Durie, Lawson, and Balcan-

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. iv.

[2] See Melville's Diary, 1584, where a copy of the document will be found. See also Calderwood, vol. iv. p. 144.

[3] Calderwood's History, vol. iv. pp. 198, 199.

quhal were women of spirit, and ventured to address a letter to the primate, rebutting the charges he had brought against their husbands, and using towards his Grace woman's natural liberty of speech. The magistrates got orders to dislodge them from their houses, and accordingly the poor ladies were obliged to sell their furniture and deliver up the keys. Other ladies of Edinburgh, who were known to have used their tongues too freely against the obnoxious acts, were banished north of the Tay.[1]

By this severity the spirit of the ministers was broken, and many of them began to give in their submission. John Craig, the old colleague of Knox, not only submitted, he went further, and, in conjunction with Duncanson, the king's chaplain, he wrote a letter urging his brethren to do as he had done; and not long after, in the pulpit, he branded the refugees with the name of the "peregrine ministers."[2]

The triumph of the king was nearly complete. He might now have driven to his capital with the Church bound to his chariot-wheels. We have a letter written at this period by David Hume, one of the exiles, to James Carmichael, a recusant brother of the Church, giving some details which must have carried sorrow and despair to the hearts of the little remnant who still refused to submit. It told that "all the ministers betwixt Stirling and Berwick, all Lothian, all the Merse, had subscribed, with only ten exceptions, amongst whom the most noted were—Patrick Simpson and Robert Pont; that the Laird of Dun, the most venerable champion of the Kirk, had so far receded from his primitive faith as to have become a pest to the ministry in the north; that John Durie, who had so long resisted, had *cracked his curple* at last, and closed his mouth; that John Craig, so long the coadjutor of Knox, and John Brande, his colleague, had submitted; that the pulpits of Edinburgh were nearly silent—so fearful had been the defection—except," said he, "a very few who sigh and sob under the Cross." The truth is, the bulk of the clergy, under the influence of Craig, and the terror of losing their stipends, had subscribed, but in many cases it was with a grudge.[3]

Several of the most ancient Scottish nobles were at this period living in England as exiles. They had fled the

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. iv., year 1584. See also Melville's Diary, same date.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. iv.

[3] Tytler's History, vol. ix.

country at different times, and for various causes, but their common misfortunes drew them together. They kept hovering about the borders, with the exiled ministers in their train, impatiently waiting some event which might enable them to return. Toward the close of 1585, an opportunity not to be lost occurred. Lord Maxwell, one of the most powerful of the border chiefs, had quarrelled with Arran; they formed a league with him, marched northwards, gathering their dependents as they proceeded, and were soon before Stirling, where the king and Arran were. When Arran saw that all was lost he fled, and the king, unprovided for a siege, had no alternative but to open the gates and receive the exiles, who upon bended knees implored his forgiveness, and were received into favour.

The hopes of the Church now rose high. The king was in the hands of their friends, and they expected no less than a reversal of the obnoxious acts and a legal sanction to their favourite policy. As the parliament was cited to meet in December, the clergy came flocking to Dumfries, toward the end of November, to hold an Assembly there, but the gates were shut against them, and they had to meet in the open fields. They adjourned to Linlithgow; but their meeting was in vain. The king called them loons, smaiks, and seditious knaves; and the lords told them they must attend to themselves first, and that then they would do something for the Church. Their chagrin as usual found vent in the pulpit. A young man named Watson ventured in his sermon to reprove the king to his face. He was sent to Blackness. Gibson, the minister of Pencaitland, preaching in his room, said it had been supposed that it was Arran who was the persecutor of the Church, but now it was seen to be the monarch himself, and that if he continued his wicked courses the curse denounced against Jeroboam would fall upon him—he would be rooted out and be the last of his race.[1] Gibson followed Watson to prison. The zealous Balcanquhal was once more in Edinburgh, and once more in his pulpit. On a Sunday in January 1586, the king was among his auditors. Balcanquhal thought it a fitting opportunity to expatiate upon the unlawfulness of bishops. The king rose from his seat and said he would pledge his crown he could prove there ought to be bishops set over the clergy. The preacher maintained he

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. iv. p. 487.

could prove the contrary, and after some further altercation, he was allowed to proceed with his discourse.[1]

In the meantime a scene of a different kind was going on in the neighbourhood of Dumfries. Lord Maxwell, who had been the chief instrument in restoring the refugee nobles and ministers, was a Papist; and glorying in his services and the greatness of his power, he fondly dreamt that he might openly profess his faith with impunity. On Christmas Eve 1585 he assembled a number of priests in the town of Dumfries, with all the gentlemen and gentlewomen in the district who were still attached, though in secret, to the religion of Rome. During the night a procession was formed, and with carols and lighted tapers it moved on to the College Church of Lincluden. There mass was celebrated, sermons were preached, and the religious services were concluded by two days of feasting in Lord Maxwell's house. For twenty-five years the country had not seen such a sight, and rumours of the midnight procession, the carols, the tapers, the mass, flew everywhere. The ministers were instantly on their watchtowers sounding an alarm; and Maxwell, potent though he was, paid for his presumption by three months' imprisonment in Edinburgh Castle.[2]

The Provincial Synod of Fife had not met for two years; but now it assembled once more, and Andrew Melville was again present to direct its proceedings. Archbishop Adamson was its victim. He was charged with being the author of the obnoxious acts of 1584, and solemnly excommunicated. On the next day, a cousin of the archbishop, attended by some of his servants, proceeded to the church, and excommunicated Andrew and James Melville, and some of their coadjutors.[3] Thus in a Presbyterian country was the unholy spectacle—which Rome had more than once witnessed—revived, of rival popes anathematizing one another.

A.D. 1586. Every day was making it more evident that something must be done to place the policy of the Church upon a more satisfactory footing. The ministers had begged the king to reconsider the recent legislation, and the king, by the pen of Archbishop Adamson, had defended it.[4] A conference, moreover, had been held between

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. iv. Spottiswood's History, lib. vi.

[2] Historie of King James Sext, Ban. Ed.

[3] Calderwood's History, 1586. Melville's Diary.

[4] Calderwood gives the documents on both sides, vol. iv. An answer to Adamson was written by Melville.

the Council and some of the leading ministers, and the terms of a compromise agreed upon, which only required the sanction of the General Assembly. On the 10th of May the Assembly met in the Upper Tolbooth, at Edinburgh. James, by his Commissioner, requested them to delay proceeding to business till the afternoon, and to meet with him then in the Chapel of Holyrood. The royal request was readily complied with, and the Assembly met at the time and place appointed. As usual, several candidates were nominated for the moderatorship. The king voted first, and his candidate was carried. During eighteen sessions this Assembly sat; but the most important business regarded the Episcopal order. It was resolved that by bishops should be meant only such bishops as were described by Paul; that such bishops might be appointed by the General Assembly to visit certain bounds assigned to them, but that in their visitation they must be subject to the advice of the provincial synod; and that, in receiving presentations and giving collation to benefices, they must act according to the direction of the presbytery within which the vacant benefice lay; and, finally, that they must be answerable for their whole conduct to the General Assemblies.[1] Thus, again, did the Church give its consent to a modified form of Episcopacy. But how carefully was it hemmed round, and with what evident pain was it wrung from reluctant presbyters!

Other important business was despatched affecting the Church's policy. It was agreed that henceforward the Assembly should meet once a-year, and to this the royal assent was given. A platform of presbyteries was produced, and the respective jurisdictions of kirk-sessions, presbyteries, and provincial synods were carefully chalked out. Archbishop Adamson made some submissions, and was absolved from the excommunication of the Synod of Fife. The excommunication of Melville was referred to the Presbytery of St Andrews. Thus peace was patched up by James's kingcraft. The king took an active part in all the deliberations of the Assembly, sometimes being present himself, and sometimes by his Commissioner, and expressing either his approbation or disapprobation of its various acts.[2]

Towards the end of the year, it became known in Scotland that Elizabeth had determined to bring Mary to the block.

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, May 1586.

[2] Ibid. Calderwood.

James was not a man to act with the spirit which the emergency required; but he instantly despatched an embassage to London, and requested the ministers in the meantime to remember his mother in their prayers, asking "that it might please God to illuminate her with the light of His truth, and save her from the apparent danger wherein she was cast." The ministers of Edinburgh refused, pleading that to pray for her preservation would imply a belief in her innocence, and a condemnation of the conduct of Elizabeth. In these circumstances his Majesty appointed Adamson to officiate in the High Church, that in his own presence public prayers might be offered up for his mother—a pious wish which we cannot but applaud. On entering the Church, however, he found that Cowper,[1] the ordinary minister, had already taken possession of the pulpit. James rose in his seat, and addressed the minister. "Mr John," said he, "that place was destined to-day for another; but if you will remember the charge that has been given, and remember my mother in your prayers this day, you may go on." Cowper answered that he would do just as the Spirit of God directed him—an answer very significant of the times. The king commanded him to come down. He looked as if he would resist, and the captain of the guard stepped forward to enforce the royal mandate. He descended the pulpit-stairs, muttering that that day would rise up in witness against the king on the great day of the Lord.

A scene of wild confusion ensued; the people groaned and shouted; most of them followed the outed minister to the door; and the king exclaimed, "What devil ails the people, that they will not stay and hear a man preach?"[2] When order was restored, Adamson went to the pulpit, and preached on the duty of praying for all men. He was confessed on all hands to be an eloquent man. On this occasion he had a subject of thrilling interest, for the jeopardy of the unfortunate queen would give a pathos to his arguments; and Spottiswood records the powerful impression he produced. But neither embassage nor prayers prevailed. On the 8th of February 1587, Mary was executed at Fotheringay: and, as

---

[1] Row and Calderwood say he was the minister of the church. Spottiswood says he had not yet been received into the ministry at all.

[2] Row's History, pp. 115, 116. Row says he was present and witnessed the scene. Spottiswood and Calderwood likewise give a description of it.

usually happens, her death has thrown a halo of glory around her more than questionable name, and she has become one of the heroines of history.

A.D. 1587. In the month of June the General Assembly met. The king wished the Assembly to absolve Montgomery, the Archbishop of Glasgow, and to censure Gibson and Cowper for their insolence in the pulpit. The Assembly offered to relax the sternness of their discipline toward the archbishop, if the king would relax in the severity of his demands in regard to the preachers; but James would not listen to this species of barter in ecclesiastical discipline, and so the affair was dropped.[1] In the following month the Three Estates assembled. At their first sitting, commissioners from the Church appeared, and demanded that the prelates who were present should be removed, as they had no authority to sit as its representatives in the meeting of the Estates. The Abbot of Kinloss defended the right of the prelates, and bitterly remarked that the ministers, having thrust them out of the Church, now wished to thrust them out of the State too.[2] They were allowed to remain, but it was only to see themselves stripped of their ancient splendour and power. An act was passed, annexing the temporalities of all benefices to the Crown.[3] According to this act the teinds remained sacred, but all the Church lands were secularized.

Various causes concurred to the passing of this act—a fatal one to Episcopacy in Scotland. The royal revenues were very scanty, and James was persuaded that in this way they might be largely augmented without having recourse to taxation, to which his subjects were not yet sufficiently tamed to submit. The bishops were made to believe that the tithes annexed to their respective Sees would support them in affluence; and it is probable that these amounted to more than the revenues which they actually enjoyed. The ministers had always resisted the secularization of ecclesiastical property; but they hated the bishops more than they loved their lands, and they let the one go in order that the other might go with them. Every acre of the Church's patrimony had now passed into other hands, and though the teinds were still unsecularized, the Church henceforward became a pensioner of the State, receiving a small dole out of what was once all her own. The Crown was very little enriched by the act of

---

[1] Calderwood's History, 1587. [2] Ibid.

[3] Acts of the Scotch Parliament, James VI.

annexation. James's easy disposition led him to give away to others what he could not at once enjoy himself. His courtiers grew great upon the spoils of the bishops and abbots; and he had nothing left to himself but regret at his double folly, in first plundering the Church and then squandering the booty.

The year 1588 was one of intense excitement to all Christendom, and Scotland felt the pulsations of the common heart. The mighty armada, which was to hurl Elizabeth from her throne, had put to sea. The Papists believed that the time of their restoration was come. The Popish nobles in England and Scotland were plotting to join their arms to those of the Spaniard. Jesuit priests, already known and dreaded all over the world for their craft, their disregard of all principle, and their undying devotion to Rome, were gliding about the country. The alarm was universal. James, after a period of hesitation, acted with vigour. The Protestant lords assembled their vassals; the parliament passed stringent laws against Papal emissaries; a solemn bond of allegiance and mutual defence was widely signed; the country was preserved in quietness; and soon the joyful tidings flew from place to place that the invincible fleet had been smitten by the skill of the English admirals, and afterwards scattered by a succession of violent storms. Still the panic did not altogether subside; for it was known that several of the most potent earls in the kingdom were ready for revolt. They actually took arms; but James placed himself at the head of his troops, and soon compelled them to submit.

The young monarch was now bent upon matrimony. He had despatched ambassadors to Denmark to affiance for him the daughter of its king, and he impatiently awaited the coming of his bride; but contrary winds prevented her setting sail, and James, at last losing all patience, gallantly proceeded in quest of her, committing himself, Leander like, to the waves, as Asheby wrote to Queen Elizabeth.[1] He found her at Upsal, and was united to her in wedlock by his own chaplain, David Lindsay—the only Scotch Presbyterian minister who ever united a royal pair.[2] After a merry winter spent at the Danish court, James brought home his bride,

---

[1] Calendar of State Papers (Scotland), 1589.

[2] The language used in the marriage ceremony was French. Adam, Bishop of Orkney, married Mary and Bothwell. He had joined the Protestants, but can scarcely be called a Presbyterian minister. He was Commissioner of Orkney.

and was now as full of joyfulness and good-nature as a bridegroom should be. Proceeding to church, he caused public thanks be given to God for his safe and happy return. Wishing to lose no time in having the queen solemnly crowned, he chose Robert Bruce, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, to perform the ceremony; but some of his brethren had well-nigh marred the matter, by objecting to the anointing with oil, as a Jewish and antichristian custom. James, however, was imperative; and throwing out a hint that, if they did not choose to do as he wished, the bishops would, he silenced, if he did not remove, their scruples.[1] Upon a Sunday in May 1590, the imposing ceremony took place in the Chapel of Holyroodhouse; and Melville, assuming the laureate, read on the occasion his noble poem, the "Stephaniskion."

During the king's absence in Denmark, the country had been remarkably quiet. This was partly to be ascribed to the efforts of the clergy; and James was sensible of this. He had made Robert Bruce a member of the council appointed to govern the kingdom during his absence; he kept up a constant correspondence with him, called him good Mr Robert, joked with him about his new rib, and declared he was worth the quarter of his kingdom. On the Sunday following that of the queen's coronation, he proceeded to the High Church, to render public thanks for his return to his kingdom in possession of a wife. When the sermon was done, the minister called upon the king to confirm the promises he had made to the Church. James stood up in his seat in the loft, and made a harangue. He said he had come to church to thank God for his prosperous return, the people for the good order they had maintained, and the ministers for having stirred them up to fast and pray for his safety. He promised to prove a loving, faithful, and thankful king; to amend his former negligence; to see justice done without fear or favour; and make better provision for the Church. He confessed that he had in the past done some things which had better been undone; but now that he was married, and had seen more of the world, he would be more staid, and meant immediately to address himself to business.[2]

Upon the 4th of August, the General Assembly convened in Edinburgh, and James Melville, as Moderator, preached the opening discourse, in which he declaimed against the sins of

---

[1] Calderwood's Hist., vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] Calderwood's Hist., vol. v.

the times. James was present at the eighth session of the Assembly thus begun. The Moderator propounded to him all that the Church desired. James made a speech, for to make a speech was his delight. He promised much; and in the end, we are told, "he fell forth praising God that he was born in such a time as the time of the light of the gospel—to such a place as to be king in such a Kirk, the sincerest Kirk in the world." "The Kirk of Geneva," he continued, "keepeth Pasche and Yule: what have they for them? they have no institution. As for our neighbour Kirk in England, it is an evil said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings. I charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors, elders, nobles, gentlemen, and barons, to stand to your purity, and to exhort the people to do the same; and I, forsooth, so long as I brook my life and crown, shall maintain the same against all deadly."[1] When this royal oration was concluded, we are told "the Assembly so rejoiced that there was nothing but loud praising of God, and praying for the king for a quarter of an hour." If the Assembly had known the whole future, it would have mingled trembling with its mirth. The king was no doubt sincere at the time, but whatever he felt, it is certain his proceedings must have been highly displeasing to the autocratic Queen Elizabeth. Within a month of the Assembly, and as if in anticipation of it, she wrote to James warning him against a new sect which had arisen in both their realms, who would have no king but a presbytery, urging him to stop the mouths of those who made orations about the persecuted Puritans, and hoping that, however he might bear such audacity himself, he would not suffer her to receive such indignities at the hands of such caterpillars.[2]

In 1591 the troubled life of Archbishop Adamson came to a close. He had been again excommunicated for marrying, at the request of the king, the Popish Earl of Huntly to a sister of the Duke of Lennox; for the presbyters of those days held that a pestilent Papist had no right to enjoy the pleasures of wedlock. He had, moreover, lived beyond his means, and being unable to pay some stipends which were payable out of his Episcopal revenues, he was not only censured by the courts of the Church, but outlawed by his creditors. He is said to have been fond of magnificent living; but it is probable his Episcopal revenues, eaten up by his patron, were never able to support his Episcopal state; and the king un-

---

[1] Calderwood's Hist., vol. v.

[2] Calendar of State Papers (Scotland), 6th July 1590.

generously made matters worse in his old age, by bestowing the bishopric upon the young Duke of Lennox. Adamson came to absolute want, and was glad to beg a bit of bread from his enemies. A recantation of his opinions in regard to Episcopacy was paraded in the Assembly; but few will now be inclined to put much stress upon it. There is pathos, and perhaps truth too, in the following story given by Row:—"'I gloried over much in three things,' said the dying man, 'and God has now justly punished me in them all. I gloried in my riches and great living, and now I am so poor that I have no means to entertain myself; I gloried in my eloquence, and now few can understand what I say; I gloried in the favour of my prince, and now he loves any of the dogs of his kennel better than me.'"[1]

As the volatile James was at present in great good humour with the Church, it was resolved to take advantage of his favourable disposition. On the 21st of May 1592, the General Assembly was convened at Edinburgh. Immediately after the elevation of Bruce, the king's favourite, to the Moderator's chair, it was resolved that suit should be made to his Majesty for the following articles:—1. That the acts of parliament made in 1584 against the discipline, liberty, and authority of the Kirk should be annulled, and its discipline, as then practised, sanctioned by law. 2. That the act of annexation should be abolished, and the patrimony of the Church restored. 3. That abbots, priors, and other prelates should be debarred from sitting in parliament as the representatives of the Spiritual Estate. 4. That the country should be purged of idolatry.

The parliament assembled on the 29th of May. The petition of the Church was taken into consideration, and an act passed ratifying the liberty of the Church, giving a legal jurisdiction to its courts, abrogating the acts of 1584, in so far as they impinged upon ecclesiastical authority in matters of religion, and providing that presentations should henceforward be directed, not to the bishops, but to the presbyteries within whose bounds the vacant benefices lay. This important act was tantamount to the entire subversion of the Episcopal polity, and the re-establishment of the National Church upon a Presbyterian basis. It is frequently spoken of as the Magna Charta of the Church. It, in fact, legalized the most important parts of the "Second Book of Discipline," for which the Church had so long contended. For nearly twenty years

---

[1] Row's History, p. 131, Wodrow Edition.

Episcopacy and Presbytery had been jumbled together; but they were found to be irreconcilable. For nearly twenty years the presbyter had done battle with the bishop, and at this period in the contest he stood victorious. The act of annexation, however, was not repealed, and all hope of the Church recovering its lost lands was gone.

CHAPTER XIII.

Before allowing ourselves to be carried farther down in our history by the fast-flowing current of events, we must pause and discover what we can of the institutions, customs, and condition of the Church at the period to which our narrative relates. The traveller who would thoroughly explore a river, from its source among the mountains to its outlet in the sea, must not suffer his bark to glide unceasingly down the stream; he must occasionally moor it to the bank, that he may examine the channel over which the current flows, and the character of the vegetation which grows upon its brink. As time and space condition all things, the manners and ideas of a people condition their history.

A great change has occurred in the country since we last attempted to sketch its moral and religious features. The Papal Church was then supreme; it stood like an ancient oak, casting its umbrageous branches over all the land; now the axe has been laid to its root, and a vigorous shoot springing from its stock bids fair to emulate the magnitude of the former trunk without its rottenness. The nation was then just waking into life; now it was almost dizzy with the excitement of new ideas continually flashing upon the mind, and with deep draughts from the cup of liberty. "When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion, we were like them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter, and our tongue with singing."

The General Assembly was the most remarkable growth of the Reformation. It spontaneously sprung into existence fully accoutred for its work. Strong from the very first, it was a Hercules in its cradle, far more powerful in its infancy than it is in its old age. The very year of the Reformation the Assembly met, and at once proceeded to business, as if it had already inherited the land. It early assumed a lofty bearing;

it remonstrated with regents; it defied parliaments; it bearded kings; it claimed a jurisdiction independent of all civil control. Nor was it mere assumption; its strength warranted its ambition. It is not too much to say that for many years the General Assembly was a more influential body than the parliament. What, then, was the secret of its strength? Where did it lie? The question admits of an easy solution.

The General Assembly was built upon a broad basis. Had it been a mere convention of ecclesiastics, it would have had the weakness which such conventions have always exhibited, especially in Protestant countries. But from the very first the Church of Scotland laid aside the notion of priestly exclusiveness. The laity were largely admitted into all its courts, just because it did not recognise the distinction between the laity and clergy.[1] It never knew a sacerdotal caste. Every man in the nation, professing the Reformed faith, who held a high office or influential position, was invited to attend. The regents, the king, the members of the Privy Council, the higher nobility, the barons, had a seat and a vote when they chose to exercise them. The qualification of being an elder was not insisted on.[2] In the first General Assembly there were but forty-one members, and only six of these were ministers. In the sederunt of every Assembly, the miscellaneous character of its members is indicated. The sederunt of August 1572 runs thus:—"There were present the earls, lords, superintendents, barons, commissioners to plant kirks, commissioners of provinces, universities, and ministers."[3] Before the Assembly of August 1573, bishops had been introduced into the Church, and accordingly the sederunt then stands:—"There were present the earls, lords, barons, bishops, superintendents, commissioners to plant kirks, commissioners of provinces, towns, and

---

[1] This idea is well developed in the Duke of Argyll's admirable Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland.

[2] The regulations of July 1568, in regard to those who should vote in the Assembly, do not seem to have been applied to the nobility.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 132, Peterkin's Edition. In the sederunt of the Assembly of December 1563, we have the names of the leading nobles given. There were—the Duke of Chastelherault, the Earl of Argyll, the Earl of Moray, the Earl of Morton, the Earl Marischal, the Earl of Glencairn, Maitland of Lethington, the Secretary of State, Sir John Wishart of Pittarrow, the Comptroller, Sir John Ballantyne of Auchnool, the Justice-Clerk, the Lords of Secret Council, superintendents, ministers, and commissioners of kirks and provinces. These were the leading men of the kingdom. Anything they agreed upon would have as much the force of law as an act of parliament.

kirks, with the ministers." In this Assembly, we find the somewhat curious resolution agreed upon in the first session:—"Because it is understood that certain of the nobility of this realm and Secret Council are to repair to this Assembly; therefore the whole brethren ordain, that the whole nobility and council, with commissioners of provinces, towns, and kirks, having power to vote, shall sit within the bar of the said over-Tolbooth, and all others without the same."[1] Thus by a council of the Church were its own ministers thrust without the bar, to give ample room enough to their lay coadjutors.

But there is nothing brings out the ideas of the Church in regard to who should be the constituent members of its highest court so well as a letter which the Assembly of March 1574 directed to the Regent Morton. "It is known unto your Grace," says the Assembly, "that since the time God blessed this country with the light of His evangel, the whole Church most gladly appointed, and the same by act of parliament was authorised, that two godly Assemblies of the whole general Church of this realm should be every year, as well of all members thereof in all estates as of the ministers; the which Assemblies have been since the first ordinance continually kept in such sort that the most noble thereof, the highest estate, have joined themselves by their own person in the Assemblies, concurring, voting, and authorising all things there proceeding with their brethren. And now at the present the Church is assembled according to the godly ordinance, and looks to have concurrence of their brethren in all estates, and wishes of God that your Grace and Lords of Privy Council will authorize the Church in the present Assembly, by your presence, or by others having your commission, in your Grace and Lordship's name, as members of the Church of God; for as your Grace's presence and the nobility's should be to us most comfortable, and so most earnestly wished of all, so your Grace's absence is most dolorous and lamentable . . . and so we give you admonition in the name of the Lord, *extending this admonition to every person of whatever estate that is present with your Grace.*"[2]

The General Assembly was essentially a representative body, and possessed the strength which every such body necessarily has. The Scotch parliament was a very imperfect representative of the Scotch people. But the Assembly contained the

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 137.

[2] Ibid., pp. 139-40.

representatives of every class. The nobles were there in considerable numbers, and beside them sat the representatives of provinces, of towns, of universities, of congregations. We may therefore regard the voice of the Assembly as the voice of the people. The Church of Scotland was in fact a spiritual republic, and the General Assembly its supreme court. Another source of the Assembly's power lay in the frequency of its meetings. Twice every year it was summoned together, sometimes more frequently.[1] If any emergency arose, the members came hurrying together from every part of the country, to deliberate and act as the occasion required. If a parliament was convoked, the Assembly met a few days before it, to make up a catalogue of its grievances and requests to be laid before the Estates.[2] Under the guidance of able and energetic men—Knox, Erskine, Davidson, and Melville—its proceedings were always marked with uncommon vigour, and necessarily commanded respect. Perhaps yet another source of strength may be mentioned: the Presbyterian Court inherited some of the superstitious respect which was anciently paid to the councils of the Papal Church, and its sentences of excommunication were regarded with as much awe as the anathemas of Rome.

We have no record of the Assembly debates, but we know that the ministers from the pulpit were in the habit of declaiming upon the topics which had been first discussed upon the Assembly floor. In this way the sympathies of the people were enlisted, and subjects, which otherwise would scarcely have been known beyond the walls of the Assembly-house, were proclaimed through the length and breadth of the land. The pulpit supplied the people periodically with the news of the churches. And shall we doubt that man and woman received the truth in much docility from the mouth of their minister? On some occasions they were asked to testify their approval by holding up their hands.[3] In this also we have a source of the Church's power.[4]

---

[1] King James early saw this, and attempted to restrain the frequency of meeting. He would allow only one meeting in the year, and was even anxious to manage that no meeting should be held without his sanction.

[2] For instances of this see Book of Universal Kirk, pp. 145-155.

[3] Scott's Apologetic Narration, p. 66, Wodrow Ed.

[4] Before leaving the Assemblies it may be stated, that the Moderators at this period were generally chosen from a leet by the vote of the house; and that the first instance of an advocate appearing at the bar of the Assembly was to plead the case of the Bishop of Dunkeld, who had dilapidated his benefice. The Assembly refused to hear him. This was in 1575.

After thirty years of experiment and change, the minister alone remained as the recognised religious teacher of the people. The superintendents and commissioners were fast dying out, and were not to have successors. The readers and exhorters still continued in many parts of the country, and we find them frequently rebuked for assuming to themselves the administration of the sacraments;[1] but in 1580 the Assembly declared them to be no ordinary office in the Church, and they gradually sunk into the subordinate position of clerks or precentors.[2] The bishop had fiercely struggled with the presbyter for pre-eminence, and was destined to struggle again, but in 1592 the presbyter kept the field. There is a singular notice in the records of the Assembly of April 1576, which, while it shows the anxiety of the Church to maintain the respectability of its ministers, throws a shade of suspicion as to the vocation of some of them. It is as follows:—Any minister or reader that taps ale, beer, or wine, and keeps an open tavern, should be exhorted by the commissioners to keep decorum."[3]

At this period the English Church was agitated in regard to ecclesiastical vestments. The Scotch Church sympathized with the Puritans, and directed a letter to the Anglican bishops, begging them to make allowance for tender consciences in such trivial and indifferent matters as tippets, cornets, and capes;[4] but no such controversy appears ever to have been agitated in Scotland itself. Every surplice and every stole seems to have been burned up in the Reformation bonfires. But the Assembly thought it right to prescribe the everyday garments of the ministers and their wives, and we have a curious minute upon the subject; "Forasmuch," it is said, "as a comely and decent apparel is requisite in all, especially in the ministers and such as bear function in the Church; first, we think all kind of broidering unseemly, all *bagaries* of velvet on gowns, hose, or coats, and all superfluous and vain cutting out, *steiking* with silks; all kinds of costly sewing or variant hues in *sarks*, and kind of light and variant hues in clothing, as red, blue, yellow, and such like, which declare the lightness of the mind; all wearing of rings, bracelets, buttons of silver, gold, or other metal; all kind of superfluity of cloth in making of hose; all using of plaids

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 191.

[2] Ibid., pp. 158, 196. See also Second Book of Discipline.

[3] Ibid., p. 160.

[4] Ibid., pp. 49, 50.

in the church by readers or ministers, in time of their ministry and using their office; all kinds of gowning, coating, *doubletting*, or breeches of velvet, satin, taffety, or such like; all costly gilding of *whingers* or knives, or such like; all silken hats, and hats of diverse and light colours; but that their whole habit shall be of grave colour, as black, russet, sad gray, sad brown, or serges, worsted, camblet, *growgrame*, *lytes*, *worsitt*, or such like; and, to be short, that the good Word of God by them and their immoderateness be not slandered; and their wives to be subject to the same order."[1]

Thirty-six years after the Reformation there were still upwards of four hundred churches unsupplied with Protestant preachers.[2] Ministers had multiplied fast, but not so fast as to have filled more than one-half of the pulpits even after this lengthened period. We need not marvel at this, for the body of learned men from whom alone the clergy could be chosen must have still been extremely small, and the stipends allowed by the State, instead of tempting men to prepare themselves for the work, were so scanty and so ill paid as to have led many to abandon it.[3] The Romish clergy had been forced into an outward compliance, at least, with the Protestant faith and worship, and one would have imagined that the ministry might have been largely recruited from their ranks. But they

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1575, p. 149.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1596, p. 437. See also Calderwood. "There are in Scotland 900 kirks, of the quhilk there are 400 without ministers or readers." (Diary of Robert Birrel.) The number of ministers and readers appears to have decreased. From the Register of Ministers and their Stipends in 1567, it would appear there were then about 1080 churches, under the charge of 257 ministers, 151 exhorters, and 455 readers. Moreover, the places of 12 ministers and 53 readers are marked vacant, making in all 928 persons, besides the five superintendents. According to the Register of 1574, there were about 988 churches, supplied by 289 ministers and 715 readers, with the places of 20 ministers and 97 readers vacant; making in all 1121 persons. The difference in the proportion of ministers and readers in the two Registers arose from the Regent Morton placing three or four churches under the care of one minister, assisted by readers. In this way the difference between a minister's stipend, about 200 merks, and a reader's stipend, about 20 merks, was saved by the parsimonious regent. (See the Analysis of the Ancient Registers of Ministers by Dr Laing, the Editor of the Wodrow Miscellany, vol. i. pp. 325-27.)

[3] Several Acts of Assembly were made to prevent ministers abandoning their office. (Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 125, 126.) Melville, in his Diary, speaks of some ballads that had been made against those who had deserted their vocation, or, as it is expressed, put their hand to the plough, and drawn back. (P. 15, Ban. Ed.)

seem to have exhibited a general indisposition to undertake the duty of preachers. The General Assembly more than once complained that they ate up two-thirds of the benefice, and did none of the work, and was evidently inclined to compel them to exercise their spiritual functions according to the Protestant forms.[1]

The "Book of Common Prayer" was still used in the service of the Church, and sometimes as a help to private devotion. John Knox had portions of it read to him while he lay upon his death-bed.[2] In December 1564, the Assembly ordered all ministers and readers to provide themselves with a copy of the Psalm-Book, with the Order of Geneva attached (which had just then issued from the press), to assist them in the celebration of the sacraments;[3] and in October 1579, the parliament ordained that every gentleman worth three hundred merks yearly, and every substantial seaman and burgess worth fifty pounds in goods or land, should possess himself with a Bible and Psalm-Book, for the better instruction of himself and his family.[4] The early Church appears to have been disposed to prescribe a method of preaching as well as of prayer. In 1581 the Assembly gave a commission to Mr Thomas Smeton to prepare such a form;[5] and even ten years before this there is a reference in the records of the Privy Council to a "book called the Homilies for Readers in Kirks."[6] Such helps were at first imperatively required. The Church-services, in the majority of cases, could not have been conducted without them.

In the "Diary" of Melville and the "History" of Buchanan, we get a glimpse of a devout household at their devotions in

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 86. "The haill brethren conveint and assembled thocht meit that ane supplication be presentit to the supreame magistrate anent sic persons as hes receavit ther benefices in papistrie, payand now allanarlie their thirds, thinkand themselves therethrough dischargit of all further cure in the Kirk; requireing at his Grace what order shall be tane anent sic persones." (Assembly, February 1569. Ibid. p. 107.) The Assembly of 1573 was still more explicit: "Seeing the most part of the persons who were canons, monks, or friars within this realm, have made profession of the true religion, it is therefore thought meet that it be enjoined to them to pass and serve as readers at the places where they shall be appointed." (Calderwood's History, vol. iii. p. 297, Wodrow Edition.)

[2] M'Crie's Life of Knox. [3] Keith's History. Calderwood's History.

[4] James VI., parl. vi. chap. lxxii.

[5] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 219.

[6] Quoted in Appendix to Dr M'Crie's Life of Melville.

the age which immediately followed the Reformation. It was the custom, after both dinner and supper, to offer up a prayer, to read a chapter, to make comments upon it, and to conclude by singing a psalm. This was the usage in the house of the Regent Moray;[1] it was the usage of John Knox while he lived at St Andrews;[2] it was the usage of John Durie, one of the ministers of Edinburgh. The Assembly attempted to force it upon James VI., and James, with the advice of his Council, made some show of submission, but he did not religiously adhere to it.[3] "In time of meals," says James Melville, who was frequently an inmate of Durie's family, and married his daughter, "was reasoning upon good purposes, namely, matters on hand; thereafter, earnest and long prayer; thereafter, a chapter read, and every man about gave his note and observation upon it; . . . thereafter was sung a psalm; after which was conference and deliberation upon the purposes in hand; and at night, before going to bed, earnest and zealous prayer, according to the estate and success of matters."[4] Traces of this ancient practice have lingered in some ministers' families to the present day.

The personal piety of the times appears to have been deep and sincere, but somewhat tinctured with fanaticism and superstition. Some of the more eminent ministers were in the habit of spending seven or eight hours together in prayer; and the power of working miracles and uttering prophecies was claimed by themselves, and joyfully conceded by the people. In their higher ecstasies, they sometimes enjoyed visions of angels; and in their more depressed states of mind, the devil appeared to them under some fantastic shape, and either engaged them in combat, or tempted them to sin.[5] Such superstitions, however, were not confined to the Scotch ministers; the most eminent divines of Germany and England were vexed about the same period by such apparitions.

When the Protestant Church abolished the Roman festivals, it substituted days of fasting. By the direction of the Assembly, Knox drew up a treatise on Fasting, for the guidance of ministers, which still remains, and throws much light upon the

---

[1] Buchanan's History, book xix.

[2] James Melville's Diary, p. 21, Ban. Ed.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1596, p. 433. Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 140. Register of Privy Council, vol. iii. pp. 264-5.

[4] Melville's Diary, pp. 60-1.

[5] Proofs of this will be found in the writings of Knox, and in the Lives of Welsh, Bruce, Livingstone, &c.

early Church. "The abstinence," it says, "is commanded to be from Saturday at eight of the clock at night, till Sunday after the exercise at afternoon, that is, after five of the clock; and then only bread and drink to be used, and that with great sobriety,—that the body craving necessary food, the soul may be provoked earnestly to crave of God that which it most needeth, that is, mercy for our former unthankfulness, and the assistance of His Holy Spirit in time to come.

"Gorgeous apparel would be abstained from during the whole time of our humiliation, which is from one Sunday in the morning till the next Sunday at night; albeit that the straitness of abstinence is to be kept but two days only.

"Because this exercise is extraordinary, the time thereof would be somewhat longer than it is used to be in the accustomed assemblies. And yet we would not have it so tedious that it should be noisome to the people. And therefore we think that three hours, and not less, before noon, and two hours at afternoon, shall be sufficient for the whole public exercise; the rest to be spent in private meditation by every family apart."

A fast so long continued and so severe, implying entire abstinence from food for a part of two days, and a great abridgment of the ordinary diet for eight; five or six hours spent in church on the Sundays, and two or three during every day of the week, would ill sort with the notions of modern times. But such fasts appear to have been religiously kept during the enthusiasm of the Reforming period. It is very remarkable that all the lessons prescribed for the Church-service on these occasions are taken from the Old Testament, and not one from the New. It is characteristic of the age, and of the temper of the men who lived in it. Their religion, in some of its aspects, was more Jewish than Christian.

To a sensitive mind, the discipline of the Presbyterian Church must have been far more terrific than the most painful penances of the Church of Rome. Every crime required to be confessed in the face of the congregation; and the penitent, when making his confession, was clothed in sackcloth. In the case of all heinous crimes, such as adultery or murder, the penitent was obliged to stand three several Sundays in a public place before the church-door, "bare-footed and bare-headed, clothed in a base and abject apparel,"—the murderer holding in his hand "the same weapon which he used in the murder, or the like, bloody in his hand."[1] Thus stationed, he was

---

[1] Order of Excommunication, p. 130.

required to confess his sin and penitence to all who entered the church, and beg their forgiveness. Nor, while thus seeking admission to the body of the faithful, might he join in their prayers; the utmost that was allowed him was to listen from afar to the sermon, in which, very probably, his crime was denounced.[1] It was not unusual for the Church Courts to hand over delinquents to the magistrate, to have the punishment of the sword superadded to that of the keys.[2] Felons sometimes underwent the discipline of the Church, and were then executed. In 1570, two men were convicted of an abominable crime, and this was the manner of their punishment. First, they were kept in prison for eight days, and fed upon bread and water; they were then stationed at the market-place, with the inscription of their fault written on their forehead; after that they were placed in the church, to repent before the people on three several Sundays; they were next ducked in a deep loch over the head three several times; and, last of all, they were bound to a stake, and burned to ashes.[3]

In some cases the discipline of the Church was extended to matters which are now properly placed under the head of political economy, and not of morals. Thus an elder of the Church, named Gourlay, was compelled to make public repentance for having exported some wheat. The regent attempted to save him, stating that he had acted with his license and authority, and that such economic arrangements did not belong to the Church; but it was in vain. On another occasion a Senator of the College of Justice was debarred from the sacraments, for having remained in Edinburgh during the rebellion.[4]

The discipline of the Church was extended impartially to all. Haughty lords and high-born ladies were compelled to submit to it, and Acts of Assembly passed that none, whatever their rank, should be exempted from sackcloth.[5] Un-

---

[1] Order of Excommunication, p. 130. Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 118, 119, 125, &c.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 189, &c.

[3] Historie of King James Sext, p. 64, Ban. Ed.

[4] Calderwood's History, vol. iii. pp. 328, 343.

[5] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 139. Among the early subjects of the Church's discipline, we find the Earl and Countess of Argyll, the Earl of Arran (at that time the prime minister of the country) and his Countess, Lord Angus, and others of the highest nobility. The Duke of Lennox and the Earl of Montrose were threatened with excommunication for entertaining excommunicated persons. Many others among the nobility were excommunicated for Popery.

happily, many of the earliest subjects of the Church's discipline were its own ministers and readers. Within the first ten years of its existence, the General Assembly, notwithstanding the paucity of ministers, had under its notice seven or eight clerical offenders, and one unhappy man—the minister of Sprott—was hanged for the murder of his wife.[1] This may be accounted for, either by supposing that some vicious men had got into office in the hurry of filling up vacant parishes, or that the immorality of the ministers was only a part of the general immorality of the times—hitherto tolerated in the bosom of the Church, but to be tolerated no more. The most celebrated among these delinquents was Paul Methven, one of the most popular of the Reforming preachers. He was caught in adultery. In the Romish Church his crime would have been winked at, but not in the Protestant. He was deposed from the ministry, and excommunicated. In piteous and abject terms he begged that he might be restored, even though it should be "with the loss of some member." Coming into the Assembly, "he prostrated himself on the floor with weeping and howling," and the Assembly were moved to receive him again, but not till, on two separate preaching-days, he presented himself at the door of the Church of Edinburgh, bare-headed, bare-footed, clothed in sackcloth, begging forgiveness: doing the same at Jedburgh, repeating it at Dundee, in which places he had previously ministered. It was agreed that after undergoing this painful penance, he should be invested with his own apparel, and received into the Church, but still not restored to the ministry till the ensuing Assembly. Poor, sinning, penitent Paul underwent one-half of the punishment; but, overwhelmed with shame, he could not endure more, and fled to England.[2]

The records of the Church Courts would lead us to believe that the morals of the people were at this period exceedingly debased. We have constant references to all manner of conceivable and inconceivable crimes, which the magistrates are importuned to punish.[3] The poor are stigmatized as having been especially degraded. "Universally throughout the realm," says the Assembly record, "there is neither religion nor discipline with the poor, but the most part live in filthy

---

[1] Bannatyne's Memoriales, &c.

[2] Acts of the Assembly, 1564-6. Book of the Universal Kirk. Calderwood's History.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 29, 143, 332, &c.

adultery, incest, fornication; their children are unbaptized, and they themselves never resort to the church, nor participate in the sacraments"[1]—a fearful picture! but it is probable that the zeal of these good men against sin has given the picture a darker colouring than the reality. Still the state of society must have been deplorably bad; it was an Augean stable the clergy had to cleanse. The Scottish peasantry at this time were miserably poor, and poverty, by rendering the decencies of life impossible, became the parent of vice. The whole land swarmed with beggars;[2] and gangs of bronze-coloured gipsies strolled about the country, and are talked of as "defiling it with their abominations."[3]

One of the reputed sins of this period was witchcraft. Many persons, especially women, were supposed to have renounced their baptism, and, by an obscene act of homage, to have devoted themselves to the devil.[4] They were said to sail through the air, to assemble at midnight in churches, to raise violent storms, to affect the subjects of their sorcery with slow, wasting diseases. The belief was universal; and it is perfectly certain that some wretched creatures really fancied themselves in league with the wicked one, and practised rites which they believed to have power with him. While James was in Denmark, Satan was affirmed to have assembled a number of his supposts, some of the masculine and others of the feminine kind, in the Church of North Berwick, in order to raise storms at sea to prevent the young queen from coming safely to Scotland.[5] Several of these were afterwards seized and put to death. One of them, called Agnes Sampson, was generally known as the wise wife of Keith, "a woman," says Spottiswood, "not of the base and ignorant sort of witches, but matron-like, grave, and settled in her answers." In her examination she declared "that she had a familiar spirit, who, upon her call, did appear in a visible form, and resolve her of any doubtful matter, especially concerning the life or death of persons lying sick," and that her words of conjuration were "hollo, master."[6] In other cases, these dupes of their own *diablerie* placed an image in

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 333.

[2] Second Book of Discipline. Also acts of parliament passed at this period.

[3] Row's History, p. 141.

[4] Dæmonologie, by King James VI.

[5] Historie of King James Sext, p. 241.

[6] Spottiswood's Hist., lib. vi.

wax of their unsuspecting victim before a slow fire, and the image and the victim wasted away together. The Church shared in the popular belief, and denounced witchcraft as a sin, the parliament declared it to be a crime, and the king not only busied himself to hunt out and burn the unhappy creatures, but proved his orthodox zeal by writing a treatise on the subject.[1]

For many years after the Reformation the Sunday continued to be desecrated by markets, and all manner of work; but the Church Courts laboured with a laudable earnestness to effect a change. In the Assembly records we find frequent complaints of salt-pans being at work, of mills being at work, of the operations of husbandry going on, and of fairs being held on the day of rest.[2] Earnest efforts were made to put a stop to such irregularities. The Presbytery of Edinburgh proceeded still further. The Edinburgh weekly market was held upon Monday, and the Presbytery wished it abolished, on the ground that many who came to it began their journey on Sunday. The attempt created a riot; and King James was hugely delighted with the idea that the soutars had intimidated the ministers more than he could.[3]

In a previous part of our history we gave some account of the religious dramas—the Mysteries and Moralities—which were acted in the Romish Church. These did not cease with the Reformation, although we may believe that their peculiar hue would vary with the times. The Virgin, the blessed apostles, the beatified saints, would vanish from the stage; Old Testament judges and kings would now figure in their stead. But it soon began to be thought unseemly to have dramas founded on the Bible narrative, and, accordingly, the General Assembly in 1575 determined that henceforward no clerk-plays, comedies, or tragedies, based upon the canonical Scriptures, should be acted either upon Sunday or work-day, and that profane plays should be examined before they were exhibited, and in no case acted on the Sunday. In the very next year the Bailie of Dunfermline asked permission of the

---

[1] Dæmonologie by King James VI. Historie of King James Sext. Spottiswood, lib. iv. Tytler, vol. ix. In 1597 no fewer than twenty-four witches were burned at Aberdeen. See the Records of the Kirk-Session of Aberdeen, published by the Spalding Club.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 160, 228, 344, &c.

[3] Historie of King James Sext, p. 254. The editor of Calderwood gives us a specimen of the rhymes which were published on the occasion, taken from the Cotton MSS. See note to vol. v. p. 177.

Assembly to have a play performed on a Sunday afternoon, but it was peremptorily refused.[1] It is curious to contemplate John Knox as delighting in theatricals, and as present at a play in which one of the divertisements was the hanging of the Laird of Grange; but so it was, and that in his old age, when he was rusticating at St Andrews. "This year, in the month of July," says James Melville, "Mr John Davidson, one of our regents, made a play at the marriage of Mr John Colvin, which I saw played in Mr Knox's presence: wherein, according to Mr Knox's doctrine, the Castle of Edinburgh was besieged, taken, and the captain, with one or two with him, hanged in effigy."[2]

But Robin Hood plays were the particular delight of the Scottish people. On a Sunday in May, the people, led by their magistrates, assembled in some green field in the neighbourhood of their village or town; one of their number, by previous arrangement, personated the celebrated outlaw Robin Hood, another his faithful squire Little John; and in boisterous fun and frolic the day was spent. In the same merry month the young women and children were accustomed to meet, choose a Queen of May, and, dancing around some greenwood tree, to make the air, far and near, vocal with their sweet voices. So early as 1555 the parliaments attempted to prevent these practices, and declared that if any provost or bailie, council or community, chose any such personages as Robin Hood, Little John, Abbot of Unreason, or Queen of May, they should lose their freedom for five years; and that if any woman, by singing about summer trees, made perturbation to the queen's lieges, they should be put upon the cuckstool of the burgh or town.[3] But parliament was almost powerless to prevent a practice that had become inveterate. The attempt to enforce the law in Edinburgh in 1561 led to serious riots.[4] Even the elders and deacons of the Church sometimes so far forgot themselves as to give these amusements their

---

[1] For very curious notices upon this subject see Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 146, 159, 165, 174, 192.

[2] James Melville's Diary, p. 22.

[3] Mary, parl. vi. c. 61.

[4] Knox's History, book iv. There is a reference to these Robin Hood plays in the Diurnal of Occurrents, May 1572. After noticing that at that time there was a great dearth in Edinburgh, it is added—"Nevertheless, the remainder abode patiently, and were of good comfort, and used all pleasures which were wont to be used in said month in old time—viz., Robin Hood and Little John."

patronage and presence;[1] and for more than thirty years after the Reformation, we find the Assembly sometimes begging the civil power to interfere and put an end to the evil, and sometimes threatening its own spiritual censures against the disobedient.

The age was fond of pageants. Every great occasion called forth a display of them. We have a minute description of those which greeted James VI. on his first public entrance into Edinburgh, which will give us a general idea of them all. "At the West Port he was received by the magistrates of the town under a pompous *payle* of purple velvet. The Port presented unto him the Wisdom of Solomon, as it is written in the third chapter of the First Book of Kings; that is to say, King Solomon was represented with the two women that contended for the young child. This done, they presented the king with the sword for the one hand, and the sceptre for the other. And as he made further progress within the town, in the street that ascends to the castle, there is an ancient port, at the which there hung a curious globe, which opened artificially as the king came past, wherein was a young boy who descended craftily, presenting the keys of the town to his Majesty, which were all made of fine massive silver, and these were presently received by one of his honourable council at his own command. During this space Dame Music and her scholars exercised her art with great melody. Then, in his descent, as he came opposite to the house of Justice, there showed themselves unto him four gallant virtuous ladies, to wit, Peace, Justice, Plenty, and Policy, and each of them had an oration to his Majesty. Thereafter, as he came toward the chief collegiate church, there Dame Religion showed herself, desiring his presence, which he there obeyed by entering the church, where the chief preacher for that time made a notable exhortation unto him for the embracing Religion and all her cardinal virtues, and all other virtues. Thereafter he came forth and made progress to the market-cross where he beheld Bacchus, with his magnificent liberality and plenty, distributing of his liquor to all passengers and beholders, in such appearance as was pleasant to see. A little beneath is the market-place of salt, whereupon was painted the genealogy of the Kings of Scotland, and a number of trumpets sounding melodiously, and crying with a loud voice, Welfare to the King.

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 192.

At the East Port was erected the conjunction of the planets, as they were in their degrees and places the time of his Majesty's happy nativity, and the same lively represented by the assistance of King Ptolemy. And withal the whole streets were spread with flowers, and the front houses of the streets, by which the king passed, were all hung with magnificent tapestry, with painted history, and the effigies of noble men and women."[1]

The printing-press had been helpful in effecting the Reformation, and soon after its establishment the Church began to take an instrument so powerful for good or for evil under its care. So early as 1563, it was ordained by the Assembly that no religious book should be published without being first revised by the superintendent of the diocese.[2] In 1568 Thomas Bassandyne, at that time a printer in Edinburgh, was accused of having printed a book entitled the "Fall of the Roman Kirk," in which the king was named as the supreme head of the primitive Church. He was farther charged with having published a psalm-book, "in the end whereof was found printed a bawdy song called 'Welcome Fortune,'" and all this he had done without the license of the magistrate or the revisal of the Church. He was ordered by the Assembly to call in the books he had sold, to retain those that were unsold, and henceforward to print nothing without the license of the magistrate, and in the case of religious books, the revisal of a committee of the Church.[3] There flourished in Edinburgh at the same time another printer called Robert Lekprevik. He had obtained from the Privy Council the monopoly of printing all books in Latin or English necessary "for the weill and commoditie of the lieges of the realme, and also all sic things as tend to ye glorie of God;" but his trade does not seem to have thriven, for in 1570 he appeared before the General Assembly asking its aid in his undertakings, and the Church, having respect to his poverty, the great expense he had been at in buying printer's irons, and the zeal and love he bore to the Church at all times, granted him a yearly pension of fifty pounds.[4]

In 1573 the Assembly voted forty pounds to Richard Bannatyne, the faithful servant of John Knox, to assist him in preparing the MS. History of his old master for the press, and

---

[1] Historie of King James Sext, pp. 178, 179.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 16.

[3] Ibid. pp. 100, 101.

[4] Ibid. p. 119.

appointed a committee of some learned men to give him their help.[1] In the following year it was reported to the Assembly that a French printer of great celebrity, who had been banished with his wife and family for the sake of religion, was willing to settle in this country, and bring with him three thousand francs' worth of books, and print whatever work he should be commanded, if he were made sure of a yearly pension of three hundred merks.[2] The Assembly thought it right to bring this proposal before the regent; but nothing appears to have been done. Six years after this we find the Assembly bringing under the notice of the king that the country stood greatly in need of a printer, and that a stranger banished for his religion, called Vantrolier, had offered to exercise his craft for the welfare of the country, if his Majesty should give him a license and privilege.[3]

Neither the General Assembly nor the Privy Council had the most remote conception of a free press. The Assembly appointed a committee to revise all books before their publication, and to give them the benefit of their imprimatur if they were approved. Adamson had rendered the Book of Job into Latin verse ; Hay had written a book against the Jesuits: they were required to submit them for inspection. Popish books were pouring into the country ; pedlars from Poland were hawking them about ; the Church called upon the regent to interfere. Nor was the Privy Council more enlightened. Davidson had published a dialogue between a clerk and a courtier, satirizing the regent for creating pluralities in order to enrich himself. He was cited before the Council, and finally obliged to abscond.[4]

It was in 1579 that the first edition of the English Bible issued from the Scottish press. So early as 1575, the Assembly entered into terms with Thomas Bassandyne, the printer previously referred to, and Alexander Arbuthnot, a merchant burgess of Edinburgh, for the production of this great work, stipulating among other things that £4, 13s. 4d. should be the price of a copy. It was merely a reprint of the Genevan Bible with a few corrections. George Young revised the proof-sheets ; Robert Pont composed the calendar ; the General Assembly made the dedication to the king to run in its name ;[5]

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 135.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. iii. p. 336.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 200, 201.

[4] Calderwood's History, vol. iii. pp. 301-36.

[5] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 187. Calderwood's History, 1579.

and the parliament made the purchase of it compulsory upon all who were able to bear the expense.

The same parliament which made Protestantism the religion of the realm pronounced Popery to be a crime. To perform a mass or be present at a mass three times was death. The Church frequently importuned the magistrate to purge the land of idolatry, and it is all but certain that hundreds and thousands, under the pressure of fear, succumbed to a religion which in their hearts they abhorred. It does not appear that the laws were frequently put in force in all their rigour;[1] but it sometimes happened that what the magistrate was unwilling to do, the mob took in hand; and it were idle to deny that unhappy Romanists were generally regarded, and frequently treated, as unclean beasts, to be hunted down and exterminated from the land. About Easter 1565, a Romish priest named Sir John Tarbat was laid hold of as he rode rapidly through Edinburgh. It was suspected he had been celebrating mass. He was taken to the Tolbooth, invested with his sacerdotal garments, dragged to the market-cross, tied up there, with a chalice bound in his hand, and kept in that position for an hour, "during which time," says Knox, with great glee, "the boys served him with his Easter eggs."[2] The next day he was tried for his life, and convicted, but mercy was extended to him, and this was the manner of it. "He was set upon the market-cross for the space of three or four hours, the hangman standing by, and keeping him; the boys and others were busy with eggs-casting." There was like to be a tumult, as the Papists made an effort to save their pilloried priest; the magistrates were obliged to interfere, and carry him off to the Tolbooth; and it was afterwards rumoured, though wrongously, that the poor man had died of the ill-usage he had received.

In 1569 a similar scene took place at Stirling. While the Regent Moray was there, four priests belonging to Dunblane, who had lingered too fondly by the ruined altars of their ancient cathedral, were condemned to death, "for saying mass

---

Dr M'Crie, in the Appendix to his Life of Melville, speaks of the arrangement being made in March 1575, but I have not been able to find this in the records of the Assembly.

[1] Bishop Lesley gives candid testimony to this fact.

[2] Knox's History, book v. In justice to Knox it must be stated, that it is generally understood that this part of his History was written by some other hand. There can be little doubt, however, but that the Reformer would have rejoiced at such a scene.

contrary to the Acts of Parliament." The regent, in the exercise of his clemency, saved their lives, "but caused them to be bound to the market-cross, with their vestments and chalices, in derision, where the people cast eggs and other villany in their faces, by the space of an hour, and thereafter their chalices and vestments were burned to ashes."[1] But clemency like this was thrown away. The tender mercy of the Protestants was abused. Popish priests still persisted in saying mass, and so, on the 4th of May 1574, one of them was laid hold of in Glasgow and hanged.[2] No monumental stone marks this man's grave; his very name has been suffered to perish; but was he not a martyr to his faith? Strange inconsistency of human nature, that the very men who had loaded with all opprobrious epithets the persecutors under the Papacy, should now be such zealous persecutors themselves! Long years required to come and go before the great principle of mutual toleration was understood and acted upon. From the beginning of the world men clearly saw that it was wrong for others to persecute them; it is scarcely two hundred years since they began dimly to see that it was wrong for them to persecute others.

In some districts of the country, the Catholics were still so numerous, that it was not safe to meddle with the priests in celebrating mass. This was the case at Aberdeen, Dunkeld, Paisley, Eglinton, and many other places. We find it therefore arranged, that a day should be appointed for all the Protestants in the neighbourhood of these places to assemble and proceed in a body to apprehend the violators of the law.[3] We are not informed what was the result of these tumultuous assemblages.

The Assembly had its own species of legislation, and its own means of coercion. An act was made, requiring every one to take the sacrament, an act which was to be put in force against all who were suspected of Popery, with the awful sentence of excommunication in case of refusal.[4] Thus the Holy Supper of our Lord, designed to be a bond of brotherhood and a feast of love, was converted into a stone of stumbling, and a rock of

---

[1] Historie of James Sext, p. 40.

[2] Diurnal of Occurrents, 4th May 1574. The entry is,—"There was ane priest hangit in Glasgow callit ——— for saying mess."

[3] Diurnal of Occurrents, 20th October 1572.

[4] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 147. Calderwood's History, vol. iii. p. 346. There were more acts than one of this kind backed by acts of parliament.

offence. The devoted Roman Catholics would regard the taking the sacrament from a Protestant minister as the primitive Christians regarded the throwing a grain of incense upon the altar of Jupiter. Many would succumb to terror; a few would resist; and to be excommunicated—altogether apart from its spiritual effects—was to be cut off from society, to lose all the rights of a man and a subject, and to be shunned as a loathsome leper.

The horror diffused through every Protestant country by the Massacre of St Bartholomew, and the butcheries of Alva in Holland, the alarm kept alive by the preparations of Spain for the invasion of the island, the known strength of the Papal party both in England and Scotland, the machinations of that new order, who bearing the blessed name of Him who was without guile, were already notorious for every species of deceit, and already to be found in every country of Europe, naturally led the Estates to add new severities to the penal code. The Church had frequently begged them to take order with Jesuits and seminary priests, and they did so.[1] In 1587 an act was passed, declaring that all Jesuits and seminary priests found in the country should be taken and put to death, and that every one harbouring them for three nights should be liable to the confiscation of his goods. To bring into the country Papistical books, to distribute these, to attempt by argument or persuasion to make any one decline from the true religion, was likewise declared to be a misdemeanour, punishable with the loss of property.[2] About forty years before this, the same parliament passed a similar law against Protestant books being brought into the country, or Protestant arguments being uttered; the tables were turned!

The Papacy was crushed in Scotland, but it was by no means destroyed. Its adherents were still both numerous and powerful. There is still in existence a remarkable state-paper in the handwriting of Lord Burghley, and belonging to the year 1589, in which we have an estimate of the comparative strength of the Roman Catholic and Protestant parties. From this document it would appear, that the whole northern part of the country, including the counties of Inverness, Caithness, Sutherland, Aberdeen, and Moray, with the sheriffdoms of Buchan and Angus, and Wigton and Nithsdale in the south, were still almost entirely Catholic, commanded by Popish

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 329, 330, 331, &c.

[2] James VI., parl. xi. chapters xxiv. xxv. xxvii.

noblemen, and giving shelter to Jesuit priests. On the Protestant side were ranked the counties of Perth, Stirling, Fife, Lanark, Renfrew, and Dumbarton. Ayr and Linlithgow were regarded as dubious.[1]

At the same period the General Assembly presented to the king a picture of the country equally dark. Many of the noblest families in the land still adhered to the ancient superstition, notwithstanding the terrors of excommunication. Jesuits were everywhere prowling about, seducing the people. Priests were openly celebrating mass, and abusing the ordinances of baptism and marriage. The ladies especially were wedded to idolatry. Ladies Herries, Morton, Mar, Minto, Tweeddale, Sutherland, Ryder, Farnyhurst, and others, were all active in their support of Romanism. They sheltered the proscribed priests, they practised superstitious rites, they kept Pasche and Yule; and some of them were represented as having themselves horribly usurped the administration of the Lord's Supper with bread and water. In some districts the churches were falling into ruins; in others, there were churches, but no ministers; in others, both churches and ministers, but few people to attend them. In Lennox, of twenty-four churches, only four had ministers; and in some of the northern counties, the state of matters was still worse. Confident in their numbers, the Papists in some places ventured to be insolent. They defied the law, assaulted Protestant ministers, to the effusion of their blood and the danger of their lives, and had their Christ's wells, pilgrimages, bonfires, and carols, as if the land were still in the bondage of Rome.[2]

This divided state of the country must have generated religious rancour, as certainly as decomposing matter generates noxious gases. There was oppression on the one hand, the thirst for revenge on the other; there was the pride of new domination confronted by the memory of ancient empire. The Romanists had lost their supremacy, but they were not without hopes of regaining it; the Protestants had got the upper hand, but they were not without fear that they might lose it. The Romanists were busy intriguing, the Protestants in watching them. A ship arrives in port from France or Spain, a stranger of distinguished appearance is seen to land from it: the minister reports the case to the magistrates, and

---

[1] Tytler's History of Scotland, vol. ix.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 330-32. Calderwood's History, vol. iv. p. 664.

requests them to seize upon the ship, and keep it till the mystery is cleared up. A suspicious-looking man has been observed skulking about the country, visiting at the houses of suspected Papists, dropping a call at the cots of the peasants: the matter is reported to the Assembly, by the Assembly it is reported to the Council, and if the disguised Jesuit has not already decamped, he is in danger of the judgment.

But there was danger not merely from the plots of the Papists, but from the Protestants themselves relapsing into error; and to this the ministers were jealously alive. Scotland was ill provided with the means of education, worse now than before the Reformation, for the monasteries had been destroyed, and nothing substituted in their stead; and parents were therefore in the habit of sending their children to France and other Continental countries to be educated. Some of these returned Romanists. The Church took alarm, and passed an act prohibiting parents from sending their children out of the realm upon any such pretences.[1] The Edinburgh clergy went further. The merchants of the metropolis had carried on a lucrative traffic with Spain. The ministers brought this before the magistrates as a crime to be prohibited, and from the pulpit declared, "that no one could make a voyage to Spain without danger of his soul, and therefore they charged every one in the name of God to abstain." The merchants persevered in their voyages; the ministers cited them before the session, and commanded them to desist. The merchants complained to the king, who told them to go on as they had done; the ministers threatened them with excommunication if they did. At this crisis the town-council interfered, and by representing that many of the Spaniards were indebted to the Scots, and some of the Scots indebted to the Spaniards, and that these accounts could never be cleared unless the traffic were continued for a time at least, they managed to stay the storm.[2]

The people who had joined the Protestant Church had not been able all at once to throw off the habits in which they had been educated. Multitudes still resorted to the holy rood of Peebles, to consecrated wells, to localities sanctified by superstition. Christmas and Easter were still observed; bonfires were kindled; carols were sung. There were Papal

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 184, 185.

[2] Historie of King James Sext, pp. 254, 255. Calderwood states that the matter was brought before the Assembly.

practices at bridals and births; and wakes for the dead. The Church laboured to suppress these inveterate tendencies; but more than one generation required to die out before they succeeded.[1] We have vestiges of them at the present day. The past continually intrudes itself into the present. The Protestant preachers went further, and prudently discouraged everything which had the appearance of Popery. The Bishop of Dunkeld had administered the sacrament of the Supper upon a work-day: he was admonished never to do so except on the Sunday;[2] a marked difference must be made between it and the mass. The Duke of Athol had died, and there was a report of superstitious rites being prepared for his burial,—that there was a white cross upon the mortcloth, and that the mourners were to be clothed in long gowns, with *stroupes*, and to carry torches. The Assembly instantly despatched two of its members to inquire into this; and it was arranged that the mortcloth should be covered with black velvet, and the *stroupes* removed. It was denied that there had been any intention of using torches.[3]

The Protestantism of the king was vehemently suspected by some of the more zealous Presbyterians. There was no more ground for their suspicions than there would be for believing that the statesmen who carried the Roman Catholic Emancipation Bill were themselves Roman Catholics. James knew how strong the Popish party was in Scotland; how strong it was in England; and it was a part of his kingcraft to propitiate and conciliate all. But though a Protestant, he was never a hearty Presbyterian;[4] and he had a royal pride in exhibiting his theological gladiatorship against both Papists and Presbyters. He encountered Balcanquhal in the High Church upon the authority of bishops; he continued the argument in the palace. He wrangled with Gibson about his liberty of speech in the pulpit; and did not disdain to defend, both by tongue and pen, his Episcopal legislation. But he was equally zealous against the doctrines of Trent. He converted Lennox. He met James Gordon, a celebrated Jesuit of the family of Huntly, in single combat, and drove him from his subterfuges, to the admiration of the lords and ladies assembled at Holy-

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk. Calderwood's History—everywhere from 1560 to 1600.

[2] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 144.

[3] Ibid.

[4] This is proved not only by his whole history, but by his sentiments in the Basilicon Doron.

rood to hear the wisdom of Solomon. The Jesuit finally affected to agree with the king regarding both justification and predestination, and put the substance of what had been said into writing. The polemical monarch, on examining the document, remarked to Gordon, that, having subscribed these things, he could no longer remain a follower of Loyola; but the wily Jesuit answered that every Catholic prince in Europe would put their hands to the same articles.[1] There is reason to fear that the king, though claiming the victory, had been out-manœuvred.

There is nothing more characteristic of the times than the liberties which the ministers took with the king. Etiquette had not yet so hedged about royalty as to prevent easy access into the presence-chamber, and the utmost plainness of speech while there. Both in public and private, the ministers largely availed themselves of their privilege. They saw no special virtue in a royal argument, and never dreamt they were bound to yield to it; they saw no particular apology for a royal sin, but thought it their duty to rebuke it on the spot. Craig, in the High Church of Edinburgh, so sharply rebuked the king to his face for a proclamation he had issued affecting the Church, that he is said to have wept.[2] When the deputation of ministers waited upon James to remonstrate about the reception of the French ambassadors, the king, as was his wont, gave utterance to several oaths in the course of the conversation. Davidson remained a little behind his colleagues, and admonished the king that he ought not thus to swear, and take the name of God in vain. James was good-natured enough to take the advice well, and laughingly to thank Davidson for it.[3]

For many years after the Reformation, the utmost harmony and good-will seems to have prevailed among all the Protestant Churches. The fact that they had separated from Rome united them to one another: there was but one Papal Church and one Protestant Church. The ministers of one Reformed nation were freely admitted into the pulpits of another; the nationality of Churches was still unknown. Knox ministered in England, in Geneva, in Scotland; the Church of which he was an apostle was not limited to his native country, or to any country. It was wherever Protestantism was. When there

---

[1] Papers illustrative of the reigns of Queen Mary and King James, Ban. Club. Ed.

[2] Calderwood, vol. iii. p. 674.

[3] Ibid. p. 697.

was persecution in England, many of its preachers came into Scotland; when there was persecution in Scotland, they returned to England. Geneva was ever the refuge of all. The General Assembly formally gave its sanction to the Helvetian Confession, with some trifling exceptions; and wrote friendly letters "to their brethren, the bishops, and pastors of England, who had renounced the Roman Antichrist, and professed with them the Lord Jesus in sincerity."[1]

But when the Presbyterian constitution of Scotland became more clearly defined, and when the Assembly cast out bishops, and declared Episcopacy to be a sin, a chasm broad and deep began to form between the two Churches. The irritation of the Anglican dignitaries was increased by the rise of Puritanism at their own door. The Puritans were already numerous in the south; they held opinions almost identical with the northern Presbyters; and the bishops naturally transferred the dislike with which they regarded the one to the other. Had there been nothing akin to Presbyterianism in England the lordly prelates would have looked at it across the border with condescending kindness. Had there been no attempt to force Episcopacy upon Scotland, bishops would never have been spoken of as the bastards of Popery. We can view other forms of Church government than our own in the distance with perfect complacency; it is only when they are brought near us that our equanimity is disturbed.

The first hostile blow was struck by England. The earliest Reformers of the Anglican Church had held that there were but two orders of ecclesiastical office-bearers mentioned in the New Testament—bishops and deacons—the presbyter and bishop having been originally the same, and the superiority of the bishop an arrangement of after-growth. Dr Bancroft, on the 9th of February 1588, preached a sermon at St Paul's Cross before the parliament, in which he startled all England by pleading for the divine right of Episcopacy.[2] In this sermon the future archbishop railed against the Puritans, and turning from them he next railed against the Scotch Presbyterians. He abused their great Reformer, as a man of contentious humour; he abused their church Courts, as laboratories of treason; he lauded the king for having put them down. This attack naturally provoked antagonism. The Presbytery of Edinburgh appointed a committee to write to Elizabeth, com-

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 49.

[2] Extracts of this sermon are to be found in the Wodrow Miscellnay vol. i. pp. 477-96.

plaining of the evil treatment they had received, and to draw up a refutation of Bancroft's sermon. The letter and refutation were prepared, but never sent; and the only answer the English polemic received was contained in a small pamphlet by Davidson, and entitled "Bancroft's rashness in railing against the Church of Scotland."[1] The author presented a copy to the king, but the king was greatly troubled at it, and would have done anything to suppress it.[2] But though the battle was almost entirely on one side, it was continued. Bancroft carefully collected new calumnies against the northern Church, and published two pamphlets, one of which was entitled "Dangerous Positions, or Scottish Genevating and English Scottising for Discipline." The title indicated the tender part: it was the Puritans who were troubling him. Unhappily, the jealousy which has too long prevailed between the sister Churches of England and Scotland was begun.

Independency entered Scotland while the war betwixt Episcopacy and Presbytery was being waged, and so the three great rival schemes of Church government were brought for the first time face to face upon the field. The Independents were first called Brownists, and took their rise about 1580. Robert Brown, a preacher in the Diocese of Norwich, perambulated the country, declaiming against bishops, ceremonies, ecclesiastical courts, and the ordination of ministers. Thirty-two times was he cast into prison, sometimes into dungeons so dark that he could not see his hand at noon-day; but he persevered, and managed to draw a little congregation around him. According to the principles of this sect, every congregation formed a separate and independent church. The whole power of admitting and excluding members, of deciding controversies, and even of setting apart pastors and deacons to their work, rested with the brotherhood. They unchurched all other churches. A community holding principles like these was not to be suffered to take root in England. The congregation was broken up, and Brown, with a number of his followers, sought refuge in Holland.[3] But there dissensions arose, and Brown, with some of his sect, came into Scotland.

They took up their abode in the Canongate of Edinburgh, and soon began to make their principles known. They undertook to prove before the kirk-session that witnesses at baptism

---

[1] Extracts from these are also to be found in the Wodrow Miscellany, vol. i. pp. 496-520.

[2] Calendar of State Papers, Bowes to Burghley, 2d October 1590.

[3] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i.

was not a thing indifferent, but a sin; but the kirk-session was not convinced. Brown himself had next a conference with some members of the Presbytery, and alleged that the whole discipline of Scotland was wrong, that he and his company would not submit to it, and that they appealed from the Church to the magistrate. Lawson and Davidson were appointed to examine his writings; and this done, he was cited before the Presbytery to answer for his heresies. He boldly avowed his books and opinions, and the Church resolved to lay the matter before the king. But James did not interfere, and it was even thought that the Brownists were fostered by the court that they might act as a thorn in the side of the Church.[1]

Brown afterwards returned to England, renounced his principles, became a rector in Northamptonshire, and threw a scandal upon his austere youth by a dissolute old age.[2] But when he died, his opinions did not die with him. He had sown some seed, which, possessing a principle of vitality, sprung up, and was destined, in the course of years, to overspread the land with its abundant vegetation. It was already becoming plain that the indivisibility of the Roman Church was not to be a characteristic of Protestantism. The elements of strife—the symptoms of dissent—were beginning to appear.

The period which we have traversed, extending from 1560 to 1592, was a period of excitement, but it was a healthy excitement. The stagnant stillness of Romanism was gone; the agitation of Protestantism, the agitation inseparable from free thought, was begun. There was liberty; let us not marvel though in a few cases it had degenerated into licentiousness. And while we may not approve, let us not too rudely blame the excesses of men who were breathing for the first time the mountain air of freedom, and felt its exhilarating influences. Like the cripple restored to the use of his limbs, they felt inclined to leap with a half-frantic joy. Had they only been left to themselves, the staid and steady step would soon have succeeded.

CHAPTER XIV.

In the estuary of the Clyde, just where that noble river opens its mouth that it may pour its full volume of water into the sea, are two small islands called the Cumbraes. They had

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. iv. p. 133.

[2] Neal's History, vol. i.

swarmed with Danes when Haco led his victorious squadron from the Hebrides to dispute at Largs the sovereignty of the mainland. They had often given shelter to pirates, who skulked securely in their creeks, and landed upon the coast at their leisure. With no population, at the period to which our history relates, but a few miserable fishermen, and completely cut off from the rest of the country, one should imagine no hiding-place could be more adapted at once for concealment and escape. But the Church possessed a kind of omnipresence; and no detective police was ever more effective than were its ministers in capturing Papists. George Ker, a doctor of laws, and a brother of the Abbot of Newbattle, had been excommunicated for Popery by the Presbytery of Haddington. He came secretly to the west country. Andrew Knox, the minister of Paisley, got information that he was in the Cumbraes, and that a vessel was lying in the Fairley roads, only waiting a favourable wind to set sail for Spain. Evil was suspected, and with a company of Glasgow students, armed for the occasion, Knox was instantly upon his track. Ker was seized; the vessel was searched; and papers of a very suspicious character were found in the trunks of the fugitive. The news of all this soon spread through the country, and caused the greatest excitement. Ker was carried a prisoner to Calder, and from Calder to Edinburgh. It was on a Sunday, toward the end of December 1592, when he reached the capital. The ministers knew he was coming; they shortened their sermons; and, by their exhortations, the populace, fully armed, on horse and on foot, went forth to meet him, and conduct him to his dungeon.[1]

Among the documents found in the luggage of Ker were several blank sheets of paper, subscribed by Huntly, Angus, Errol, and Patrick Gordon of Auchindoun. It was at first suspected that these blanks were written with some invisible ink, which a future process would render visible; but it turned out afterwards that they were true blanks, to be filled up by Ker, and delivered to the King of Spain. When Ker was first submitted to examination, he denied everything; but, by the command of the king, he was put to the torture, and, on the second stroke of the boots, he confessed all. He was to negotiate the descent of a Spanish force upon the coast, which was to be joined by the Popish nobles, and the Catholic reli-

---

[1] Historie of King James Sext, pp. 256-57. Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 192.

gion re-established, or, at least, toleration secured for its adherents. Graham of Fintry, another of the conspirators, was shortly afterwards seized, and by his confession corroborated the statements of Ker.[1]

The ministry considered this a matter which specially affected them; they held a meeting in Edinburgh with a number of barons and nobles zealous for the Protestant cause; they waited upon the king at Holyrood; they offered in the emergency, to provide him with a body-guard of horse and foot; and urged him to bring the traitors to instant justice. The king was annoyed rather than otherwise at this loyal promptitude on the part of his subjects; he did not think the danger so imminent as they did; he had not observed such readiness on other occasions quite as grave; he hinted all this to them in his address; but still he thanked them, and promised that he would see justice done. The popular agitation increased instead of abating, and probably under the pressure of this, James, upon the 15th of January, by the advice of his Council and nobility, resolved that the laws against Papists of every rank should be enforced; that letters should be issued, charging the Earls of Huntly and Errol, and Gordon of Auchindoun, to compear before his Majesty and Privy Council at St Andrews on the 5th of February, to answer to the things which should be laid to their charge; and the lieges were instructed to be ready to attend his Majesty in arms, in case their services should be required.[2]

There can be no doubt but that the king was determined to punish the traitors, though he was not animated by the fiery zeal of the Presbyterian clergy. The Earl of Angus had been surprised in Edinburgh immediately after the seizure of Ker, and was in prison. Ker and Graham were in prison too. Graham was tried, condemned, and executed; but prisons in those days were not over secure, and both Angus and Ker contrived to escape.[3] The day fixed for the trial of Huntly and Errol arrived; they did not appear, but confined themselves to their strongholds in the north; and the king made instant preparations to march against them. The forfeiture of their estates was considered as certain, and the Protestant courtiers were already in fancy dividing the prey. James advanced

---

[1] Tytler's History, vol. ix. Calderwood, vol. v.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[3] Ker's jailor was afterwards hanged for his carelessness in allowing his prisoner to escape.

without opposition to Aberdeen; the Popish nobles fled before him to the wilds of Caithness, and their immense possessions were declared to be the property of the Crown. But as the Countess of Huntly was allowed to continue her residence in the principal castle of the family, and as the estates of both earls were confided to the factorage of their relatives, it was shrewdly conjectured that it was but a "dissembled confiscation."[1] Angus was more severely dealt with, but still his estates were not placed beyond reach of recovery; and no forfeiture could be considered as final till it was ratified by the parliament.

The clemency of the king was generally blamed by the Protestants, and the preachers, taking up the matter in the pulpit, hinted that James was himself a Papist at heart; some declared that he had himself trafficked with the Prince of Parma and the King of Spain; and in the excitement of the time everything was believed.[2] The truth is, the Presbyterian ministers were determined not merely upon the punishment of treason, but upon the extirpation of Popery, and nothing less would satisfy them. This is too clearly seen in the fierce intolerance breathed by the General Assembly which met at Dundee in the month of April. They laid the following petitions before his Majesty:—

1. That all Papists should be punished according to the laws of God and the realm.

2. That the act of parliament should strike upon all manner of men, landed and unlanded, in office or otherwise, as it was provided to strike upon beneficed persons.

3. That a declaration should be given against Jesuits, seminary priests, and trafficking Papists, declaring them guilty of treason and lese majesty, whereby those who harboured such persons might be punished according to law.

4. That all such persons as the Church should declare publicly to be Papists, although they were not excommunicated, should be debarred from brooking any office, having access to his Majesty, or enjoying any benefit of the laws; and that all the civil pains which followed excommunication should follow this declaration.[3]

No severer laws had ever been passed by Popery against

---

[1] Tytler, vol. ix. p. 76. Calderwood, vol. v.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 251.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 381, 382. Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 240.

nascent Protestantism, than were now sought to be enacted by Protestantism against enfeebled Popery. Had the Council granted what the Church asked, an ecclesiastical court had but to declare a man to be a Papist, and he became an outlaw. A Papist had but to let a priest come under his roof, and he was liable to the confiscation of his goods. It is true that almost all that the Church asked was already written in the statute-book; but James was wisely unwilling to put the laws into execution. How could he? Thirteen of his greatest nobles, and a considerable part of the population of the kingdom, especially in the north, were still attached to the Roman faith. Had he done so, a massacre must have ensued more terrible than the Massacre of St Bartholomew's Day.

James was still jealous of the power of the Assemblies, and of the liberty of speech used in the pulpit. He therefore requested the Assembly to send commissioners to him, to arrange the time and place for the meeting of the next Assembly; and also to pass an act prohibiting ministers, under pain of deprivation, to declaim against his Majesty or Council in their sermons. The first request was agreed to, but the second only in a very modified form. It was ordained that no minister should utter from the pulpit any "irreverent speeches against his Majesty or Council, or their proceedings; but that all their public admonitions should proceed upon just and necessary causes, and sufficient warrant, in all fear, love, and reverence."[1] The king was annoyed at the conditions with which the Assembly had clogged its resolution, for he had his suspicions as to what would be deemed "just and necessary causes," and what would be the spirit of "fear, love, and reverence" in which he would be spoken of. Time showed that there were grounds for his fear.

On the 16th of July the parliament met in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh. It was hoped that the forfeiture of the Popish earls would now be ratified, and their treason punished with beggary, if not with death; but the king was unwilling that matters should be driven to extremity; their friends were numerous, and it would have been dangerous to do so; and he tried to appease the commissioners of the Church who waited upon him to know what was to be done, by assuring them that his advocate had declared that nothing could be done in the meantime for want of proof.[2] Acts, however, were passed,

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 386.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 254.

prohibiting the holding of markets upon Sunday, exempting stipends from taxation, declaring the contemners of the Church's sentences to be rebels, and forbidding the saying of mass, or the harbouring of excommunicated Papists, under the severest penalties.[1] Still the rigid Protestants were not satisfied. On the Sunday, Davidson denounced the parliament as a black parliament, as iniquity had occupied the place of equity.[2]

The ecclesiastical courts were guided by different men, and resolved upon different measures from the high court of parliament. On the 25th of September the Synod of Fife met at St Andrews. It was under the influence of the Melvilles, and breathed their spirit. It was resolved that a solemn fast should be held to bemoan the state of the kingdom. It was resolved that the Earls of Angus, Huntly, and Errol, Lord Hume, Sir Patrick Gordon, and Sir James Chisholm, should be excommunicated, and that intimation of this sentence should be made from every pulpit in the kingdom, that none might presume to receive them within their houses, or to have any dealings, friendship, or society with them. The synod was somewhat at a loss to discover upon what pretext they could pass this sentence upon the Popish nobles, as none of them resided within the bounds; but they ingeniously hit upon the circumstances, that three of them had attended the University of St Andrews in their youth, that the same three had married in the province, and on that occasion had subscribed the articles of religion, and that all of them were in the habit of visiting their friends in Fife.[3] This was voted enough to bring them within the jurisdiction of the court.

James was anxious for quiet; he had a secret liking for Huntly; he had some thoughts of restoring him to favour. He was annoyed at the high-handed sentence of the Synod of Fife; remonstrated with Bruce against the irregularity of the procedure; and remarked that he had no rest till he had given the Church its present government, but that, seeing it was abused, he would find means to reform it.[4] He sounded the disposition of Lord Hamilton; he complained that he had not a single nobleman at his devotion; and that if he received Huntly, the ministers would cry out that he was an apostate

---

[1] James VI., parl. xiii., chapters clix. clx. clxii. clxiv.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 255.

[3] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 261-63. Spottiswood, lib. vi. Melville's Diary.

[4] Spottiswood, lib. vi.

from religion. "You may receive him," said Hamilton, "if he and his accomplices are not enemies to religion, but not otherwise." "I cannot tell what to make of that," said the king; "but the ministers hold them for enemies. For my own part, I think they should enjoy liberty of conscience." "Then we are all gone, sir," cried Hamilton, "we are all gone; and though no others withstand, I will."[1] He was like the men of his generation; he did not understand that the safety of a divided state consisted in giving freedom of conscience to all its subjects, and that if this had been granted, conspiracies would have ceased. Would Huntly, Errol, Angus, have plotted with the Spaniard and jeoparded all, had they not been denied that which was dearer to them than life?

On the 12th of October, the king left Holyroodhouse for Jedburgh, where the gentlemen of Merse and Teviotdale were charged to meet him to repress some disturbances which had taken place on the borders. When he was near Fala, the Popish earls threw themselves in his way, went down upon their knees before him, protested their innocence, and earnestly craved to be tried for the crimes which had been laid to their charge. James spoke gruffly to them; but after taking the advice of the nobles in his train, he bid them enter themselves in the town of Perth by the 24th of the month, and remain there till arrangements were made for their trial. The king was terrified lest this meeting should be misconstrued, and instantly despatched messengers to explain to the English ambassador and the Edinburgh ministers what had really occurred. This precaution did not serve its purpose; many people persisted, whether rightly or wrongly, in believing that the whole scene was a farce, concocted by the monarch himself, preparatory to the pardon of the rebels.[2]

At this very time a convention of ministers and barons was sitting in Edinburgh. They instantly despatched commissioners to the king, to lay before him what were their views as to the trial of the Popish lords. They craved that the trial should be postponed, and the traitors meanwhile kept in custody; that the jury should be nominated by their accusers, the professors of the gospel; that being excommunicated men they should have no benefit of law till they were reconciled to the Church, and that his Majesty should be accompanied to

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 268.

[2] Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v. p. 270.

Perth by a Protestant body-guard, who would see justice done.[1]

The commissioners, bearing these requests, got an audience of the king at Jedburgh, but their reception was not very gracious. James stormed against the Synod of Fife for having excommunicated the Lords; he stormed against the ministers and barons for having held a meeting without his express permission; but before the interview was concluded, his choler had somewhat abated, and he answered their remarks by stating that, seeing a trial had been craved, he could not in equity refuse it; that he would take care that it should be ordered according to justice; and that immediately after his return from the south, he would hold a convention of the estates at Linlithgow, where everything connected with the matter would be arranged.[2]

The poorest subject in the realm, if accused of crime, had a right to claim the benefit of a trial. The Popish peers had been accused, but they declared they were innocent, and that the subscriptions to the Spanish blanks were forgeries; were they to be denied the opportunity of proving their statements if they could, and condemned without a hearing? The humane maxim of law is, that a man must be held innocent till he is proved guilty. But it was becoming obvious that an impartial trial of the accused lords was an impossibility. If they were tried in a Protestant district, and by a Protestant jury, their conviction was certain. If they were tried in a Catholic district, and by a Catholic jury, their acquittal was certain. Perth lay midway between the districts which were most decidedly Protestant and those which were most thoroughly Popish, and therefore seemed the fittest place that could be fixed upon for the assize. But had the trial taken place at Perth, it is probable its beautiful Inches would have become the battle-field of Popery and Protestantism in Scotland, and the Tay have rolled red with blood. The earls had already come to the Fair City; their armed retainers were flocking fast after them. The commissioners of the Church were not behind in warlike preparations. Everywhere they cited the barons and burghs to convene at Edinburgh, to be ready against the trial. The country seemed on the brink of a terrible contest, in which old feuds would receive new vigour from religious bigotry; and men would cut each other's throats, believing they were doing God service. In this

---

[1] Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] Melville's Diary, p. 208.

threatening aspect of affairs, the king issued a proclamation, prohibiting all armed convocations of the lieges. In consequence of this, the Popish earls dismissed their forces, and remained in Perth with only a few friends, and the adherents of the Church hurried to Edinburgh, leaving their arms behind them. Some of those who had set out upon their journey in armour left their weapons by the way.[1]

On the last day of October the Estates assembled at Linlithgow. A deputation from the Protestant convention was again in waiting to urge severity. But the Chancellor Maitland, after a temporary banishment from court, was again in power, and it was evident that everything had already been arranged. It was resolved there should be no trial after the usual form; but when the petitions of the accused earls were read, a committee of nobles, barons, and commissioners of burghs was appointed to consider the whole matter, and conclude on it as they should think most expedient for the security of religion and the correction of disorders. It was, moreover, especially provided, that of the ministers, Lindsay, Bruce, Galloway, Carmichael, Rollock, and Duncanson should be admitted to the meetings of the committee, if they had anything to propose. The committee thus appointed met at Edinburgh on the 12th of November, and after several days of anxious consultation, agreed upon the following resolutions: —1. That God's true religion, publicly preached, and by law established, should be the only religion professed and practised by his Majesty's lieges in time to come; and that all who had not yet embraced the said religion, or who had made defection from it, must, before the 1st of February 1594, either conform themselves to it, and give satisfaction to the Church, or depart furth of the realm to such parts beyond sea as his Majesty should appoint. 2. That the Earls of Angus, Huntly, and Errol, Sir Patrick Gordon, and Sir James Chisholm should be "free and unaccusable in time coming" of the crimes laid to their charge in regard to the Spanish blanks, provided that they refrained from any such treasonable trafficking in future, complied with the act of uniformity, banished all Jesuits and excommunicated Papists from their presence, avoided speaking against the established religion at their tables, received a Presbyterian minister into their houses, to resolve their doubts and prepare them for subscribing the Confession of Faith.[2]

---

[1] Melville's Diary, p. 269. Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 274-80. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 284. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

This sentence was at once too lenient and too severe. The Popish nobles, if traitors, should not have been wholly exempted from punishment, and placed upon the same level with other Roman Catholics, who had never committed any crime but that of conscientious adherence to their faith. A clear line should have been drawn between the traitorous and the loyal Romanist. But, otherwise, what shall we say of a decree which presented to tens of thousands the sad alternative of renouncing their religion or their country—a life-long hypocrisy, or a life-long exile? Was ever act of conformity more sweeping—more merciless that this? The sword, or the Koran; exile, or Presbytery; the dilemma is still the same cruel one. After all, what casuist will nicely measure the sin even of the traitors? Before the Reformation, the Protestants were denied the liberty of conscience, and they trafficked with England to obtain it. After the Reformation, the Papists were denied the liberty of conscience, and they trafficked with Spain to obtain it. If the imperial parliament now were to make it death for an Irishman to be present at a mass, confiscation of goods to shelter a priest, perpetual exile unless he signed the Westminster Confession, would he do anything very morally or religiously wrong though he were to rebel?

Thus almost the whole world reasons now, but it reasoned differently at the time of our history. The ministers were indignant at the Act of Oblivion. The pulpits resounded with rebukes of the king and his counsellors. Andrew Melville offered to go to the gibbet himself if he failed to convict Huntly and his accomplices, provided they were sent to the gallows if he succeeded in his proof. The courtiers smiled, and said he was more zealous than wise.[1] Queen Elizabeth, however, sympathised with the clergy, and herself wrote a scornful, cutting letter to the king in answer to his explanations. "She could only pray for him and leave him to himself. She did not know whether shame or sorrow had the upper hand when she learned how he had let those escape against whom he had such evident proof. Lord! what wonder grew in her that he should correct them with benefits, and simply banished them to those they loved. She more than smiled to read their childish, foolish, witless excuses turning their treasons' bills to artificers' reckonings, one billet lacking only, item, so much for the cord they best merited."[2] But the general feeling

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 288, 289.

[2] Queen Elizabeth to King James, Calendar of State Papers (Eliz. Scot.), 22d Dec. 1592.

of the country is best described in a letter by Bowes, the English ambassador, to Lord Burghley. "This edict and act of oblivion," says he, "is thought to be very injurious to the Church, and far against the laws of God and this realm; whereupon the ministers have not only protested to the king and convention that they will not agree to the same, but also in their sermons inveigh greatly against it; alleging that albeit it hath a pretence to establish one true religion in the realm, yet liberty is given to all men to profess what they list, so they depart out of the realm: and thereby they shall enjoy greater privileges and advantages than any other good subjects can do."[1] Such was the feeling of dissatisfaction on the one side; on the other it was equally strong. The Popish nobles were not inclined to abandon either their country or their creed. Perhaps they thought themselves powerful enough to enjoy both; their strength must have been increased by the act of conformity; and their friends and followers began to gather around them.

While things were in this state, the Earl of Bothwell, who had more than once before made treasonable attempts to get possession of the king's person, and who was known to be encouraged by Elizabeth, broke over the border at the head of a considerable force, marched upon Leith, threatened the capital, defeated the royalists in a skirmish near Niddry—rushing upon them with shouts of "God and the Kirk!" But having obtained this slight success, he retreated upon Kelso, and there disbanding his followers, retired into England.[2] The king was deeply incensed by these repeated treasons, and insisted that he was encouraged by the ministers of the Church. It is certain there was no clamour from the pulpit to bring him to justice. But things took a marvellous turn. Bothwell's last desperate cast of the dice was to join his fortunes with those of the excommunicated lords. He was then excommunicated too.

On the 7th May 1594, the General Assembly met at Edinburgh. It ratified the sentence of excommunication passed by the Synod of Fife upon the Popish earls; it drew up, for presentation to the king, a list of disorders and their remedies; it urged that the most vigorous measures should be taken to exterminate Popery. Lord Hume, a Popish lord, in high favour with the king, appeared, made a most abject submission, declared

---

[1] Tytler's History, vol. ix. Also Calendar of State Papers.

[2] Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v. p. 297. Historie of King James Sext.

himself a convert to the Church, and was absolved from excommunication.[1] On the 30th of May the parliament met. Huntly and his associates had not complied with the conditions of the act of oblivion, and now rigorous measures were resolved upon. James made a harangue to his Estates, in which he declared that hitherto he had used plaster and medicine, but that these having failed to cure, he was to use fire s the last remedy.[2] The Spanish blanks, the depositions of Ker and Graham, the acts of parliament bearing on the subject, were produced and read; the rebels were judged, though not unanimously, to be guilty; their armorial bearings were torn by a herald, and thrown out of the window; their estates declared to be forfeited; and commission given to the Earl of Argyll to pursue them with fire and sword.[3]

Argyll was Huntly's ancient enemy, and accepted the commission with alacrity. Two ministers were despatched to urge him to undertake the work, "as a thing acceptable to God, profitable for the commonwealth, and honourable to himself;"[4] but he scarcely required their exhortations. In the beginning of October he was on his march toward the country of the rebels, followed by a rabble of six thousand Highlanders, some armed with muskets, some with bows and arrows, some with two-handed swords, and some with no arms at all. He was confronted at Glenlivet by Huntly and Errol, with a much smaller but better disciplined force; and after a sharp fight he was driven from the field.

In the meantime the king had pushed on to Dundee, where Argyll himself brought the evil tidings of his disaster. James, nothing dismayed, advanced upon Aberdeen, which he occupied without opposition. He had requested Andrew and James Melville, with some other ministers, to accompany him in his progress, and be the witnesses of his severity; and the stern Presbyters, regarding it as a crusade against idolatry, cased themselves in corslets, and marched with the host.[5]

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 404-8.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 330.

[3] Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v.

[4] Historie of King James Sext, p. 338.

[5] Melville's Diary, p. 214. It was nothing unusual for Andrew Melville to be in armour. "He merchet mikle of that day, withe a whait speare in his hand," says James Melville of his uncle, speaking of a riot at St Andrews—"as he wear a corslet therefter at the dinging down of Streabogy." (Diary, p. 210.) David Lindsay, the minister of Leith, appears to have been of a like martial disposition. "He was for stoutness and

The martial monarch was detained for some time in Aberdeen by bad weather, and his money began to fail. He remembered that the Presbytery of Edinburgh had recently raised for him the funds to entertain the ambassadors who were to be present at the baptism of his first-born. He resolved to apply to the same spiritual court again, which appears to have held the purse-strings of the nation.[1] James Melville was despatched with a letter to the presbytery, and another to the town-council. The royal letter was backed by one from the ministers who were with the army, and the money was forthcoming.[2] Thus relieved of his pecuniary embarrassments, the king pushed on to Strathbogie, the principal residence of Huntly. A majority of the war council wished this noble castle to be spared; but Andrew Melville urged that it should be destroyed, and it was accordingly blown up with gunpowder.[3] Slaines, in Buchan, the stronghold of Errol, was levelled with the ground; and a number of other fortalices shared the same fate. Huntly saved himself by fleeing to the wilds of Caithness; but some of his retainers were hanged, and the gentry who had assisted him were mulcted in considerable sums.

The spirit of the Catholic party in Scotland was now thoroughly broken. When the king returned to the south, Huntly made one more effort to renew the contest; but it was a forlorn hope, and failed. A Jesuit named Morton, bringing messages to him from the Pope, was detected, and saved himself from the torture only by confessing everything. Amongst other things found in his possession was a beautifully-carved crucifix in ivory, which he said was a present from Cardinal Cajetano to the queen. James took it up, and asked the Jesuit what was its use. "To remind me," said Morton, "when I gaze upon it, of my Lord's passion." "Look, my liege," he continued, "how livelily the Saviour is here seen hanging between the two thieves, whilst below the Roman soldier is seen piercing His sacred side with the lance. Ah, that I could prevail on my sovereign but once to kiss it before he lays it down!" "No," said James; "the Word of God is enough to remind me of the crucifixion; and besides, this

---

zeal in the guid cause mikle renouned and talked of. For the gown was na sooner af, and the Byble out of hand fra the kirk, when on ged the corslet, and fangit was the hagbot, and to the fields." (Diary, p. 26.)

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 340.

[2] Melville's Diary, pp. 214-16.

[3] Ibid.

carving of yours is so small, that I could not kiss Christ without kissing both the thieves and the executioner."[1]

Huntly and Errol, seeing that all was lost, resolved now to seek safety in exile. Father Gordon implored them not thus to abandon their country. For the last time a solemn mass was celebrated in the Cathedral of Elgin; and the devoted Jesuit, passing from the altar to the pulpit, exhorted them to hazard all rather than allow the lamp of religion to be utterly quenched in the land; but it was in vain. On the 17th of March 1595, Errol embarked at Peterhead, and two days afterwards Huntly, with a few faithful friends, embarked at Aberdeen, and sailed for the Continent.[2] With them the last hopes of Catholicism in Scotland departed. Auchindoun had been slain at Glenlivet; Hume had made his peace with the Church; and shortly afterwards Sir James Chisholm followed his example, and sought rest by making a recantation, which in all probability his conscience belied.[3]

The Church had now triumphed gloriously; the Papists had been put down, and James was at the height of his popularity, regaled by the plaudits, and no longer tormented by the taunts of the Protestant ministers. But it was the fate of this volatile king, when delivered from the buffeting of one tormentor, to be given over to another. The country was now scandalized by stories of domestic broils. James was jealous of his queen. The queen was indignant at James for entrusting the care of the infant prince to the Earl of Mar, and not to her. She formed a party among the nobles, and vexed her liege lord and husband. Things proceeded so far that the ministers interfered, and helped to patch up a reconciliation. Patrick Galloway preached a sermon before the court upon the duties of husbands and wives, and the royal pair were once more as loving as ever.[4]

A.D. 1596.

King James, like all his predecessors, was miserably poor, and, if not prodigal, neither was he thrifty. His finances was getting into utter confusion, and therefore, in the beginning of 1596, he appointed eight

---

[1] Tytler, vol. ix. Calderwood tells the story differently; but Tytler's narrative, which is founded upon a letter of the period, has the most verisimilitude.

[2] Tytler, vol. ix. Calderwood. vol. v.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 418.

[4] Calderwood, vol. v. Nicolson to Bowes, Cal. of State Papers, 15th August 1595.

eminent men to act as the chancellors of his exchequer. From their number they were called Octavians. In opposition to these, the gentlemen of his Majesty's household were called Cubiculars. As it was the great object of the Octavians to curtail the royal expenditure, and of the Cubiculars to live as comfortably and splendidly as they could, a violent jealousy soon arose between them. Several of the Octavians were suspected of a leaning to Popery; the Cubiculars therefore threw their weight into the scale of the Church; and the intrigues of those two parties are to be traced in many of the events which are now to be narrated.

The General Assembly met in Edinburgh on the 24th of March. On the second day of its meeting King James presented himself, attended by a brilliant train of his greatest nobles. As usual he made an oration. He evidently regarded the Assembly very much as the present Sovereign regards the House of Commons—the body that can give or withhold supplies; and for the same reason, that it contained the representatives of the tax-payers. He alluded to the necessity of making preparation against probable dangers, and of maintaining a standing army, now that the feudal militia was found to be useless in the presence of disciplined troops. He urged that a contribution should be made over the whole country, not to be lifted presently, but when need should require.[1] Andrew Melville bluntly said that the forfeited estates of the exiled earls should be applied to this purpose, instead of the rents being given, as they were, to their wives.

A characteristic part of this Assembly's business remains to be told. A proposal had been made in regard to an inquiry into the corruptions of all estates; and his Majesty received a hint that it was expected he also should submit to it. The king evidently did not like the subject, but, after a soothing speech from Davidson, he submitted to his fate, and said that if any gross fault were found in him or his house, he would not refuse to be judged by the Assembly, providing it were done privily.[2] A committee was accordingly appointed to draw up a list of the corruptions that prevailed, and in course presented their report. The ecclesiastical Estate had set

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 396. In the previous year the king made a proposal to the Presbytery of Edinburgh to levy troops for him, which they undertook to do, and did. (Ibid. p. 341.)

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 398.

before them rather matters which constituted offences, than offences which were alleged actually to exist: wanton behaviour, gorgeous apparel, profane company, gaming, dancing, playing at cards or dice, swearing, Sabbath-breaking, fighting, lying, keeping hostelries, taking usury, bearing worldly offices in gentlemen's houses, engaging in merchandise, buying up grain and keeping it in dearth, non-residence, selling the sacraments. In regard to his Majesty's household, it was reported that reading the Scriptures at table, and grace before and after meat, were frequently omitted; that his Majesty was guilty of banning and swearing; that his courtiers copied his example; that few of the royal household came to the week-day sermon; that the queen did not repair to the Word and sacraments, and was fond of night-wakes and balls, as were also her gentlewomen. The judges were charged with neglecting justice, taking bribes, and being altogether unfit for the office they held. The corruptions of the community at large were reported to be a universal decay of zeal, contempt of the Word, ministry, and sacraments, the masters of families not reading the Scriptures or engaging in prayer themselves, but leaving this to be abused by their cooks, stewards, and jackmen; blasphemy, Sabbath desecration, superstitious pilgrimages, bonfires and carols, gross immorality, and every other conceivable sin. The land, moreover, was declared to be overrun with pipers, fiddlers, songsters, sorners, peasants, and strong beggars living in harlotry.[1] A deputation was sent to the king to set his sins before his face; and a day appointed when the ministers might mourn over their own offences. On that day Davidson preached, and "for the space of a quarter of an hour," we are told, "there were such sighs and sobs, with shedding of tears among the most part of all estates that were present, every one provoking another by their example, and the teacher himself by his example, that the Church resounded, so that the place might worthily have been called Bochim."[2]

Armies have risen from their knees to fight and conquer; the Assembly turned from fasting to bellicose arrangements, which sound strangely in our ears. The king was petitioned to apply the forfeited estates of the rebel lords in maintaining a standing force; to authorise the minister and kirk-session in every parish to choose captains, to hold military musters, and

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk. Assembly, 1596.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 407.

train the people to arms; and to import a sufficient quantity of corslets, pikes, muskets, and other needful armour.[1] The king did not deem it prudent to give to the Church the power of the sword, as well as of the key; but before the Assembly dissolved, he sent a message to it which carried joy to every heart. It was his Majesty's intention, the Commissioner said, to devise a "constant platt," by which every church should have a minister, and every minister a stipend.[2] The Assembly broke up, and the members went home rejoicing.

Calderwood celebrates this Assembly with his loudest praises. Presbytery had now reached its culminating point. "The Kirk of Scotland," says he, "was now come to her perfection, and the greatest purity that ever she attained unto, both in doctrine and discipline, so that her beauty was admirable to foreign churches. The Assemblies of the saints were never so glorious nor profitable to every one of the true members thereof as in the beginning of this year."[3] And at the close of the Assembly, looking forward to the years that were to come, he mournfully notes, "Here end all the sincere Assemblies of the Church of Scotland, enjoying the liberty of the gospel under the free government of Christ."[4]

During the summer months, Huntly and Errol both re-entered the country in disguise, but not in company. About the same time James sounded his favourite minister Robert Bruce, as to the policy of allowing them to return from banishment, provided they should submit themselves to the discipline of the Church. Bruce would not listen to the proposal. The king asked him to take a day or two to think of it. Bruce still adhered to his former opinion. "I see, sir," said he to the king, "that your resolution is to take Huntly in favour; which, if you do, I will oppose; and you shall choose whether you will lose Huntly or me, for both you cannot keep."[5] Bruce's favour with the king was gone from that day. At a meeting of the Estates held at Falkland upon the 12th of August, a petition was presented from the earls, praying to be allowed to return, and Alexander Seton, the President of the Court of Session, supported it in a speech, arguing that, if they were driven to despair, they might, like Coriolanus the Roman, or Themistocles the Athenian, join the enemies of the State, and endanger it.[6]

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 424.

[2] Ibid. pp. 430, 431.

[3] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 387, 388.

[4] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 420.

[5] Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[6] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 438.

It was resolved, if possible, to get the concurrence of the ministers, and some of them were invited to Falkland. Andrew Melville was unasked, but hearing the business that was on hand, he joined his brethren, and presented himself before the king and Estates. James well knew the man, and asked what brought him there uninvited. "Sir," said Melville, "I have a special calling to come here by Christ Jesus the King," and then proceeded to charge the Estates with high treason against Christ, the Kirk, and the country. James interrupted him in the midst of this tirade, and commanded him to retire, which he reluctantly did. After this violent scene, it was agreed that if the Kirk and king were satisfied, it were best to recall the lords.[1]

The Church was thrown into a paroxysm of mingled fear and indignation by the intelligence of this resolution. A number of the ministers assembled at Cupar, and appointed a deputation to proceed to Falkland and remonstrate with the king. The two Melvilles were of the number; and we have a graphic description of what passed from the pen of James. He tells us that he was asked to open the matter, as the king liked his mild and smooth way of speaking; but his Majesty was exceedingly testy, and said they had no warrant to meet at Cupar at all. Upon this, the undaunted Andrew broke in, called the king "God's sillie vassal," and taking hold of him by the sleeve, "bore him down, and uttered his commission as from the mighty God." "Sir," said the stern presbyter, "we will humbly reverence your Majesty in public; but since we have this occasion to be with your Majesty in private—and the truth is, you are brought into extreme danger both of life and crown, and with you the country and Church of Christ are like to go to wreck, for not telling you the truth, and giving you faithful counsel—we must discharge our duty therein, or else be traitors both to Christ and you. And therefore, sir, as divers times before, so now again I must tell you, there are two kings and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King, and His kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James VI. is, and of whose kingdom, not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member. And they whom Christ has called and commanded to watch over His Church, and govern His spiritual kingdom, have sufficient power of Him and authority so to do, both together and severally, which no Christian king should control or discharge,

---

[1] Melville's Diary, p. 244.

but fortify and assist. And, sir, when you were in your swaddling-cloths, Christ Jesus reigned freely in this land, in spite of all His enemies; and His officers and ministers were convened for the ruling and welfare of His Church, which was ever for your welfare, defence, and preservation. . . . As to the wisdom of your counsel, which I call devilish and pernicious, it is this, that you must be served by all sorts of men to come to your purpose and grandeur, Jew and Gentile, Papist and Protestant; but because the ministers and Protestants in Scotland are too strong, and control the king, they must be weakened; they must be weakened and brought low, by stirring up a party opposed to them; and the king being equal and indifferent, both shall be fain to fly to him; so shall he be well served. But, sir, if God's wisdom be the only true wisdom, this will prove mere mad folly, for His curse can but light upon it."[1] The king was completely brow-beaten by the violence of Melville, and was glad to lay aside his testiness, and affect to look pleased. Such a scene as this reminds us of the days when popes put their feet upon the neck of emperors; or when Martin of Tours, at a public entertainment, after taking the wine-cup himself, pushed it past princes to a presbyter, remarking that the humblest of the order was superior to kings.

On the 20th of October, the commissioners of the General Assembly and deputies from several synods met at Edinburgh. They appointed a fast; they nominated a number of ministers from different parts of the country to take up their residence in Edinburgh, and meet daily with its ministers, and see *ne quid ecclesia detrimenti caperet*. They were known as the Council of the Church.[2] On the 19th of the same month, the Countess of Huntly laid before the Synod of Moray an offer of most humble submission on the part of her husband: he would find security that he would do nothing contrary to religion; he would banish all Jesuits and Papists from his society; he would meet with any ministers that might be sent to him, and listen to their arguments, and, if convinced, he would embrace the Reformed religion; he would maintain a minister in his household for his better instruction; he would assist to carry out the sentences of the Church.[3] One should imagine this submission was enough, and that a ministry who were

---

[1] Melville's Diary, pp. 245, 246.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[3] Melville's Diary, p. 247.

commissioned to preach repentance and forgiveness to the chief of sinners were bound to welcome back the penitent. But the dread of Popery had engendered a stern spirit, which knew no compromise: Huntly and Errol might be taken upon discipline by the Church; but still it was the duty of the king to see justice done—they must die the death. Happily, more merciful sentiments prevailed in the court; and it was arranged that the rebel lords should be allowed to remain in the country till May of the following year, in the hope that by that time they would be reconciled to the Church.[1]

Another source of irritation had unfortunately arisen between the king and the clergy, which had been gradually increasing, and now reached the violence of a fever. Following the example of Knox, the ministers were in the habit of freely discussing political topics in the pulpit, and of using the utmost plainness of speech in regard to the king and his courtiers. James had repeatedly complained of this to the Church Courts, but with no effect. In 1594, a preacher at Perth, named Ross, had spoken of the king as a traitor, a reprobate, and a dissembling hypocrite. He had declared that the Popish rebels were encouraged by the king, and that no good had ever come to the country by the Guisian blood.[2] The matter was brought before the Synod of Perth and the General Assembly; but Ross defended what he had said; it was admitted he had cause for it; and he was dismissed with an advice to be cautious in the future.[3] In October 1596, while the country was agitated in regard to the return of the Popish earls, David Black, one of the ministers of St Andrews, uttered a philippic against the governments of both England and Scotland. He pronounced the Queen of England to be an atheist—a woman of no religion; and that, as for the King of Scotland, none knew better than he of the return of the rebel lords. "But what could they look for?" cried the preacher; "was not Satan the head of both court and council? Were not all kings devil's bairns? Was not Satan in the court, in the guiders of the court, in the head of the court? Were not the Lords of Session miscreants and bribers, the nobility cormorants, and the Queen of Scotland a woman whom for fashion's sake they might pray for, but in whose time it was vain to hope for good."[4]

---

[1] Melville's Diary, p. 249. Calderwood, vol. v.

[2] Historie of King James Sext, pp. 315-24.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 409, 410.

[4] Tytler, vol. ix. Spottiswood, lib. vi. See also Calderwood, vol. v.,

News of this attack upon his mistress reached the ears of the English ambassador, and he complained to the king. Black was summoned before the Council, and, under the advice of the commission then sitting in Edinburgh, he followed the example of Melville, and declined its jurisdiction. It was a spiritual matter, and could be dealt with only in an ecclesiastical court. All the ministers in Edinburgh put their hands to the declinature, and then a copy of it was sent down to the presbyteries all over the country, accompanied with a letter, headed by the text, "if we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him," and requesting every minister to append his subscription to it.[1]

The Commissioners appointed to watch over the interests of the Church had been sitting for some time, and had not been idle. They had sent a deputation to the queen to complain, amongst other things, that she trifled away her time with her maids; but the queen was conveniently engaged, and they were requested to call another day.[2] They had sent a deputation to the king, to complain that his "common talk" was against the ministers and their doctrines; but the king retorted that he had good cause for what he said.[3] They had sent a deputation to the Octavians to complain that they were the root of the evil which the king had brought upon the Church, but the Octavians denied it.[4] This had been quietly borne, but James chafed exceedingly when he heard of the circular-letter to the presbyteries, and an act of the Secret Council was passed charging the Commissioners to leave the town within twenty-four hours. The Commissioners met, read and considered the proclamation and charge, "laid them open before the Lord, to be the righteous judge and revenger, as well of the slanderous lies and blasphemous calumnies thereof, as of the great iniquities and wrong done to the Lord Jesus Christ, and liberty of his Church, in usurping the judicature and discharging the acts of the General Assembly, as though it were a judicatory inferior and subaltern to the Secret Council and Session, and therefore ordained the ministers of Edinburgh, and such others as were to occupy the pulpits, to deal mightily by the word, the sceptre

---

where in the controversy regarding Black's declinature, the most of these expressions are to be found.

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 460.

[2] Ibid. vol. v. pp. 459, 460.

[3] Ibid. p. 451

[4] Ibid. p. 461.

of the Lord Jesus, the King of Glory, against the said proclamation and charge."[1]

The trial proceeded. His Majesty and Council found themselves competent judges, as the crimes charged in the libel were of a treasonable and seditious nature. But the king knew how powerful was the body with whom he was at war, and was most anxious to make peace. Deputations were continually passing and repassing between the city and the palace. James was willing to accept of a mere nominal fine, if Black would only plead guilty; but the ministers maintained that this was tantamount to yielding up the whole point at issue. It became plain that compromise was impossible. The libel was found proved, and, on the 9th of December, Black was charged by a macer to enter himself in ward beyond the north water, and to remain their during his Majesty's pleasure,[2] for the highlands of Inverness and Ross were then the place of banishment, especially for clerical delinquents.

The conduct of the ministers at this period has sometimes been defended, but in truth it is indefensible. Let us try the question according to the enlightened sentiments which are happily abroad in our day in regard to the liberty of the pulpit and the press. The ministers maintained that they were answerable for what they said in the pulpit only to the Courts of the Church; that no civil or criminal tribunal had a right to touch them. Would any minister make such a claim now? would any court in the kingdom sustain it? The minister in the pulpit occupies, and ought to occupy, the same level as the editor at his desk. If he speaks treason, he will be tried for treason; if he uses defamatory language, he will be libelled for defamation; and that before the ordinary courts of the country for trying these offences. The sanctity of the place will not save him, and should not save him. The fact that he is an ecclesiastic will not rescue him from the claws of the jury and the judge. Were a priest to spout sedition from the altar, would we allow an appeal to the bishop or the pope? Why should the presbyter be deemed more a spiritual person than the priest? But it has been said that the ministers claimed only to be tried before the Church Courts in the first instance. This is only partially true. The

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 468.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 498. The whole story was told by Bowes to Burghley, and every document connected with it forwarded to the English Court. Cal. of State Papers, Nov. and Dec. 1596.

words of Black's declinature are, "*at least in prima instantia;*"[1] and the argument by which it is supported is a general one, denying totally the jurisdiction of the civil courts in regard to preaching, which is declared to be a spiritual matter. If it were denied in the first instance, upon what pretext could it be allowed in the second? Would the Church approvingly behold the Council condemn a man whom it had already absolved? But what had the Courts of the Church to do with sedition or treason in any instance; and it was with sedition and treason that Black was charged? Was sedition less sedition because it was spoken in a sermon? was treason less treason because it was committed by a minister?

The idea of spiritual independence had been gradually growing, till at this period it had attained to a morbid size. Unknown by Knox, it was fully developed by Melville. Unmentioned in the "First Book of Discipline," it is carefully defined in the Second. Men's sentiments had changed with the change of times. When the Church was Roman, it was the duty of the magistrate to reform it. When the Church was Protestant, it was impiety in the magistrate to touch it. The assumption of the Church reached to its greatest height in the time at which we have now arrived. Its growth was favoured by the weakness of the government. The barons, when it suited their humour, defied the king; the ministers learned to do the same thing. Had bishops spoken to Elizabeth as presbyters spoke to James, she would have unfrocked them on the spot, and their brethren would have learned henceforward to speak differently. But it was different in Scotland. Melville, in the General Assembly, backed by the people, was really more powerful than James in his palace, with none to help him. The rise of such pretensions in such circumstances was natural—almost necessary. They would have grown up under the shadow of Episcopacy, as well as under the shadow of Presbytery. We know they did grow up under the broad shadow of the Papacy.

The sentence passed upon Black did not put an end to the excitement which the trial had originated. The ministers proclaimed a fast, and in their sermons denounced the king as a persecutor. The king, in return, banished the ecclesiastical Commissioners from Edinburgh, and under the influence of the Cubiculars, who were anxious to ruin the Octavians by increasing the dissensions between the court and the Church, he gave notice to twenty-four burgesses, who were known to

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 457, 458.

be devoted to the ministers, to depart from the town within six hours.[1] The Cubiculars having first inflamed the monarch against the ministers, now inflamed the ministers against the monarch, by intimating falsely, in an anonymous letter, that Huntly had had an interview with James at the palace. Balcanquhal learned this on Friday morning, just before proceeding to the pulpit for the week-day sermon. He alluded to it in his discourse, and requested the nobles and barons who were present to meet after the services were over in the Little Church, to consult as to what should be done. The Little Church was crowded to the door. Robert Bruce addressed the multitude in regard to the return of the Popish lords, the sentence passed upon Black, and the banishment of the ministers and burgesses. It was resolved to send a deputation to bring these grievances before the king.[2]

James happened to be quite at hand, sitting in the Upper Tolbooth with some of his Council. The deputation getting admission to the royal presence, said they were sent by the noblemen and barons convened in the Little Church, to bemoan the danger threatened to religion. "What dangers see you?" said the king. "Our best-affected people," said Bruce, "are banished the town; the Lady Huntly, a professed Papist, is entertained at court; and it is suspected her husband is not far off." "Who are they," said the king, "who dare convene against my proclamation?" "We shall dare more than that," said Lord Lindsay fiercely, "and will not suffer religion to be overthrown." While this was going on, a number of people had pressed into the room; the king got alarmed, and rising abruptly, he made for the door, and shutting it behind him, he retreated to the lower house, where the judges were sitting. The deputation thus unceremoniously left, returned and reported what had passed. Meanwhile the minister of Cramond had been reading to the congregation the story of Haman and Mordecai. At this nick of time a voice shouted at the church-door, "Save yourselves!" The people rose in mass as if they had discovered the rafters of the church burning over their heads. Some ran one way, some another. Some thinking the king was taken in the Tolbooth, rushed to the Tolbooth. Others, thinking that the ministers were slain in the church, rushed to the church. Some cried "To arms!" Some shouted, "The sword of the Lord and of

---

[1] Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v.

[2] Ibid. Bowes to Cecil, 17th Dec., Cal. of State Papers.

Gideon!" Some took their position at the door of the Tolbooth, and vociferated, "Bring out the wicked Haman;" "Let Seton, Hamilton, Elphinston, be delivered to us." The provost, hearing of what had happened, rose from a sick-bed, and with the assistance of the ministers managed to pacify the people. By the afternoon the streets were completely cleared, and the king, accompanied by the provost and bailies, was able without fear to walk down the Canongate to the palace.[1]

Early next morning the royal household set out for Linlithgow, and a proclamation was issued forbidding the courts of law to sit longer in Edinburgh, and to be ready to remove to such other place as his Majesty might appoint. This resolute step damped the ardour of the citizens, but not of the ministers. They met; talked about excommunicating the Lord President and the Lord Advocate; appointed a fast to be held that very afternoon; and Welsh, the son-in-law of Knox, and revered by the people as a prophet and worker of miracles, mounting the pulpit, declared the king was possessed of a devil; yea, that one devil being cast out, seven worse were entered in. They proceeded further; Bruce wrote a letter to Lord Hamilton, begging him to come and place himself at their head. Lord Hamilton hesitated for a moment; but his caution got the better of his ambition, and he refused the dangerous pre-eminence. He even played false, and showed the letter to the king.[2] Meanwhile the riot was declared to be treason by the Privy Council; and a deputation of the citizens who waited upon his Majesty, and made the most humble submissions, were received with frowns, and simply told that the Estates were about to meet and determine the punishment they deserved. The ministers fled to England. There were dreadful whisperings afloat; some said the city was to be razed to its foundations, and a monumental pillar erected where it stood to warn all future mobs of their folly and their fate. This mob had in truth been as meaningless as most mobs are; but the king, not the boldest of men, had been frightened out of his wits, and now when his courage was returned, he had resolved to make the most of it to repress the turbulence of the Church.[3]

On the 1st January 1597, he entered the city like a con-

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi. Bowes to Burghley, 21st Dec., Cal. of State Papers.

[2] Bruce to Hamilton, 18th Dec.; do. to do., accusing him of foul play, and leaving him to his conscience, 27th Dec., Cal. of State Papers.

[3] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

queror. The streets were lined with troops. The magistrates met him, and upon their bended knees protested their innocence, offered to do their best to discover the ringleaders in the riot, and promised in future to consult his Majesty in the appointment of their ministers. A sermon was preached in the High Church, and after it was done, his Majesty made an oration to the people, declaring his devotion to the Reformed faith, and his indignation at the conduct of the Reformed ministers. The Estates assembled at Holyrood. The rioters were anew pronounced to be guilty of treason; the king was vested with power to interdict ministers from preaching, or Church Courts from meeting, when he saw cause; the houses of the Edinburgh clergy were taken from them, and bestowed upon the crown; and the magistrates of the city held bound either to produce the originators of the riot, or to enter their own persons in ward by the 1st of February. By this show of firmness both the Church and the city were completely overawed.[1]

It is certain that from this time James had conceived the idea of reintroducing the Episcopal polity into the Church. He had come to the conclusion that Presbytery was essentially anarchical and foul-mouthed—a conclusion natural in the circumstances, but which a larger experience of its working has sufficiently refuted. He felt himself strong enough to make the attempt. The Edinburgh riot had been followed by a reaction. "Every conspiracy of the subjects which fails," says Tacitus, "advances the sovereign."[2] The king prepared his way by a popular measure; he accepted the resignation of the Octavians, who, notwithstanding their financial reforms, were generally odious to the nation on account of their supposed Popish predilections. He next summoned a meeting of the General Assembly at Perth against the last day of February. This done, he had fifty-five queries regarding points of the Church's discipline printed and put in wide circulation. They were cunningly put; Lord Burghley had given his help in drawing them, and, notwithstanding the king's protestations to the contrary, were no doubt designed to throw discredit upon existing practices and opinions, and to test the temper of the ministry. They touched upon the propriety of pulpit rebukes, upon excommunication and its

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi. Bowes to Burghley, 4th January.

[2] Spottiswood quotes this saying of Tacitus in regard to these events.

effects, and upon the constitution and jurisdiction of the several judicatories of the Church.[1]

The Synod of Fife met at St Andrews, and, true to its ancient principles and its redoubted leaders, answered the royal questions in a tone of ultra-Presbyterianism. Individual ministers attempted to answer them too.[2] But while this was going on in the south, Sir Patrick Murray, as royal commissioner, was busy in the north, courting and coaxing the clergy there, and winning votes for the approaching Assembly. It was not without reason that Perth was fixed upon as the place of meeting. The district north of the Tay, long guided by the counsels of Erskine of Dun, had never sympathised with the violence of Lothian and Fife. The Assembly was brought near to it, that it might feel its influence. In those days a poor minister could scarcely be expected to take to horse and ride all the long way from Angus to Edinburgh; a comparatively small number would undertake the journey from Edinburgh to Perth. The geography of the place decided the character of the meeting.

On the last day of February, the ministers from the north came pouring into Perth. Never before had so many of the northern brethren been seen at an Assembly. Sir Patrick Murray, called ironically, by James Melville, the Apostle of the North, was busy amongst them. They were taken to the house where the king was, they were introduced to his Majesty, they were smiled upon, caressed, and flattered by royalty. Meanwhile the courtiers were moving about amid the clerical throng, throwing in a remark about the pride and arrogance of the ministers of the south in usurping to themselves the whole government of the Church, and gently insinuating that *they* were much better able to manage matters. It is not to be wondered at that simple pastors from the remote districts of Caithness and Aberdeen got giddy under these adulatory attentions. They began to brag of what they could do; to talk of the popes of Edinburgh, and of how they had almost driven away the king and ruined the Church.[3]

On the 1st of March the Assembly met, and the king, by his commissioners, inquired whether they could regard themselves

---

[1] They are given at length in Melville's Diary, pp. 257-64. Paper by Lord Burghley, Cal. of State Papers, Jan. 20, 1597.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 579-99.

[3] Melville's Diary, pp. 264, 265. Calderwood, vol. v.

as a lawful General Assembly of the Church, with sufficient power to determine such matters as might be brought before them. This was keenly debated, as it involved the royal prerogative of calling Assemblies, but in the end it was carried that they were a lawful extraordinary General Assembly. The commissioners from the Synod of Fife protested against the finding, as the Assembly had not been called with the consent of the Church, and as another Assembly stood indited for another place and another day. The king next laid before the meeting, for its consideration, twelve propositions, embodying some of the most important matters alluded to in his questions. The answers, as first framed, did not satisfy his Majesty, but the Assembly was compliant, and they were so altered as to gratify his wish. In these answers it was declared lawful for his Majesty to propose to the General Assembly any matter affecting the external government of the Church which he might wish to see discussed or reformed; no minister was to reprove his Majesty's laws till he had first sought a remedy through the Church Courts; no man's name was to be mentioned in pulpit rebukes unless his sin was notorious, and notoriety was defined to consist in the person being fugitive, convicted by an assize, excommunicated, or contumacious; every summons issued by Church Courts was to mention the cause and the crime; the ministers were not to hold any meetings beyond the ordinary sessions, presbyteries, and synods; and in all the principal towns the ministers were to be chosen with the consent of the congregation and the king. The Assembly having given the weight of its authority to these important propositions, appointed a committee to deal with the Popish earls, with a view to their being restored to the Church; and then finished its labours in a charitable mood of mind, by petitioning the king on behalf of the fugitive ministers, and the capital city still groaning under the royal displeasure.[1]

The king was so pleased with his Assembly at Perth, that he resolved to have another at Dundee in the month of May, to perfect the revolution so auspiciously begun. The Northland ministers again mustered strong. Some of the royal propositions which had not been determined at Perth were now discussed, and it was resolved that his Majesty's sanction should be considered essential to give full effect to the acts of

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1597. Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 606-23.

all future Assemblies; that all ministers should be set apart to their work by the imposition of hands; that all Church Courts should keep records of their proceedings, and that these should be subject to the supervision of the superior courts; that presbyteries should not meddle with anything but what was plainly ecclesiastical; that persons having interest should be entitled to have extracts of processes before the ecclesiastical courts; and that summary excommunication should be suspended till regulations were framed in regard to it.

At the ninth session the king appeared in person, and made a short speech. He stated that on account of the shortness of the time during which the Assembly sat, many important matters were necessarily left undecided; that he was most anxious to have churches everywhere planted, and a right provision made for their ministers; and therefore he asked them to consider whether it would not be expedient for them to give a commission to some of their brethren to advise with him upon these and other matters affecting the welfare of the Church. The king had struck the right string; a minister for every kirk, and a stipend for every minister, had a peculiarly pleasing sound; and a standing commission was appointed, consisting of Alexander Douglas, James Nicolson, George Gladstone, Thomas Buchanan, Robert Pont, Robert Pollock, David Lindsay, Patrick Galloway, John Duncanson, Patrick Sharp, John Porterfield, James Melville, William Couper, and John Clapperton, with very ample powers.[1] These were, perhaps, the greatest names in the Church, if we except Andrew Melville, who, in learning and ability, towered high above all his compeers, but whose unflinching devotion to High Church principles excluded him from this courtly commission. It formed a kind of college of presbyter-cardinals, out of which the future bishops were to be chosen; and as every man began to look for promotion, he began to be subservient. Calderwood stigmatizes the commission as the "king's led horse;" and in bitterness of spirit remarks, that "it was as a wedge taken out of the Church to rend her with her own forces, and the very needle which drew in the thread of bishops."[2]

But one of the great objects of this Assembly was to take steps for the restoration of the Popish earls to the bosom of the Church. It was reported that they had attended devoutly

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, p. 461.

[2] Calderwood, vol v. p. 644. In this, as in many other things, Calderwood borrows from James Melville.

upon a prescribed course of preachings; that, after long conference with the brethren appointed to deal with them, they had confessed the truth of the Protestant religion, and expressed their abhorrence of Popery; that they had acknowledged the Reformed Church of Scotland to be the true Church, and were willing to submit themselves to it, subscribe the "Confession of Faith," maintain a minister in their families, and make provision for the churches on their estates. Upon these declarations being read, power was given to the commission to grant them absolution, and receive them into the Church.[1]

This was done at Aberdeen in the following month, and after the following fashion:—Saturday, the 25th of June, was observed as a solemn fast, on which the three earls made up all deadly feuds. The next day being Sunday, the Cathedral Church was crowded with a congregation anxious to witness the edifying spectacle of penitence and reconciliation. Immediately before the sermon was commenced, the three earls publicly subscribed the "Confession of Faith." The sermon being done, they stood up, and made acknowledgment of their apostasy—declared their deep penitence on account of it, their conviction of the truthfulness of the Reformed faith, and their resolution to abide by it. Huntly, proceeding with his confession, while his brother penitents were silent, declared his unfeigned sorrow for the murder of the Earl of Moray. After this humiliating scene, in which hypocrisy must have largely mingled, they were formally absolved from the sentence of excommunication, and received as members of the Church. A table for the celebration of the sacrament of the Supper had been spread in the centre of the church, at which the congregation now took their seats; and the earls, Popish no more, sitting down with them, received from the hands of a Presbyterian minister the sacred elements, in token of their membership with the Church.[2]

In the month of December, a parliament was held at Edinburgh. The Commissioners appointed at the Assembly in Dundee, under the influence of royal inspiration, appeared at its bar, and craved that a limited number of ministers, as representing the Church and Third Estate of the kingdom, might be admitted to vote in parliament. After some decent show of opposition, it was agreed that so many of the ministry

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 452-57.

[2] Burton, chap. lx. Tytler, vol. ix.

as his Majesty should promote to the dignity of bishop, abbot, or other prelate, should have a vote in parliament, as ecclesiastical prelates had in times past, but not otherwise.[1]

A.D. 1598.

The consent of the Estates being thus obtained, all that was now necessary was to obtain the consent of the Church to this revolutionary measure. An Assembly was indited to meet at Dundee on the first Tuesday of March. Once more the north gave up its ministers to carry the royal resolutions. But from an opposite direction, and with opposite views, came Andrew Melville. The king was present; and dreading that Melville's powers of debate might carry confusion among the northern ranks, he challenged his right to attend, on the ground that he was a doctor, and not a pastor in the Church; and that at a recent visitation of the University of St Andrews, where Melville taught, a law had been enacted prohibiting the professors from attending sessions, presbyteries, and synods, and ordaining that the regents and masters should appoint three of their number, and only three, to represent them in the General Assembly.[2] Thus Melville, known in the Church as "the slinger out of bishops," was slung out of the Assembly himself, and the bishops were brought in. During the debate upon this point, a characteristic passage-at-arms took place between the king and John Davidson, the minister of Prestonpans. Davidson, imagining that James was arguing too authoritatively, got up and said—"Sir, you are to remember that you sit not here as *imperator*, but as a Christian; *ades ut intersis non ut præsis.*" The king granted the truth of what the minister had said, but was evidently nettled at it; upon which Davidson made peace by jocosely remarking, "Sir, we are afraid to speak, unless you be equal and indifferent."[3]

After the Assembly had sat about a week, the great subject for which it was convened was brought up for discussion. Some affirmed it was thus long delayed to weary out the hostile ministers. The king opened the matter in a speech. He expatiated upon the anxious desire he felt to adorn and benefit the Church, to remove controversies, establish discipline, and restore her patrimony; and in order to this, he went on to say, it was needful that ministers should have a vote in parliament, without which the Church could not be vindicated from

---

[1] James VI., parl. xv. chap. ccxxxi.

[2] Melville's Diary, p. 289. Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v.

[3] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 683.

poverty and contempt. "I wish not," said the king, "to bring in papistical or Anglican bishops, but only to have the best and wisest of the ministry appointed by the General Assembly to have place in council and parliament, to sit upon their own matters and see them done, and not to stand always at the door, like poor supplicants, despised and nothing regarded." The bribe was great. The debate was keen. Bruce, Davidson, and James Melville exerted themselves on the one side; Buchanan, Gladstone, and Pont on the other; and the polemical monarch sometimes interrupted the speakers, and attempted to pose them by a question. It is characteristic of the period that the hottest of the fight was upon the nineteenth chapter of Second Chronicles.[1] When the roll was called, it began with the Synod of Orkney and Caithness. Gilbert Bodie, denounced by James Melville as "a drunken Orkney ass," was asked first to vote. "He led the ring, and a great number of the north followed, all for the *bodie*, without regard to the spirit." [2] It was carried by a majority of ten, "that it is necessary and expedient for the welfare of the Church, that the ministry, as the third Estate of the realm, in name of the Church, have a vote in parliament;" that the number should be the same as in the time of Popery; and that the election of these should belong partly to his Majesty and partly to the Church.[3]

It was a saying of Philip of Macedon, that any castle might be taken to which an ass laden with gold could find an entrance. The Church of Scotland was taken by a much cheaper commodity—a mixture of craft and kindness. The removal of the Assemblies to the borders of the north, and a few flattering speeches to the northern ministers, effected the matter. Who would have fancied that the Church, which but eighteen months before defied the king and his Council, declined their jurisdiction, and made them tremble in their capital, would at the royal bidding have yielded up its dearest and most cherished principles? The truth is, the bow was bent too far, and a rebound was inevitable. The state of tension which existed in 1596 could not be maintained. The extravagant pretensions of Melville and Bruce could not be allowed. Had they claimed less, it is probable the Church had lost less. In surrendering its privilege of meeting at all

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] Melville's Diary, pp. 291, 292.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1598.

times, and for all ecclesiastical purposes, it surrendered what ought to have been a sacred and inviolable right—a right to be defended to the last extremity. In consenting to fifty-one of its ministers having a place in parliament as the Spiritual Estate, it in fact consented to the reintroduction of prelacy. The terms of the act of parliament implied this, the opponents of the measure clearly saw this. David Ferguson, the oldest minister in Scotland, compared the stratagem to that of the Grecians for the overthrow of Troy—busking up a brave horse, and by a crafty Sinon persuading the citizens to pluck down the walls with their own hands, and receive that for their welfare and honour which proved their wreck and destruction. "*Equo ne credite, Teucri*," said the venerable presbyter. "Busk, busk him as bonnilie as ye can," said Davidson, "and bring him in as fairlie as ye will, we see him weel enough; we see the horns of his mitre."[1] No doubt ambition on the part of the ministers had something to do with the matter. It was no mean thing to be a bishop or abbot, have a seat in parliament, and perhaps a place in the councils of the king.

The "First Book of Discipline" had repudiated the imposition of hands in ordination; the Second Book had enjoined it; but still it would appear to have been frequently neglected. Melville, while in Glasgow, held the parsonage of Govan, and frequently preached; but he was never ordained. Robert Bruce acted for eleven years as one of the ministers of Edinburgh; but he had never been set apart to his work by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. But now the General Assembly had put its stamp upon the royal proposition that none should be admitted to the ministry but by the imposition of hands; and it was resolved that this principle should be applied to the case of Bruce. Bruce strenuously resisted, as such procedure would throw a doubt upon the lawfulness of his previous ministry. There were discussions among the ministers, conferences with the king, an unseemly altercation before the people in the Church of St Gile; but at last, under the threat of deprivation, he submitted to the ceremony—it being expressly declared, for his satisfaction, that the imposition of hands was not used as a sign of his ordination to the ministry, but of his ordination to a particular flock.

A.D. 1599. Bruce was now as violently disliked by the king as he was once esteemed. In the palmy days of his favour, he had received from James a pension of

---

[1] Melville's Diary, p. 289.

twenty-four chalders of victual out of the Abbacy of Arbroath, which was secured to him for life. James was now mean enough to attempt to deprive him of it, and the matter was brought before the Court of Session. While the case was proceeding, the king frequently came into the Court, and violently remonstrated with the judges. He is said to have sent for some of them to the palace, to talk them over to his views. When it came to the vote, and was like to go against the king, his rage became ungovernable, and he asked who durst be so bold as vote against him. Four or five of the judges rose to their feet, and said, that with all reverence for his Majesty, except he would discharge them by his absolute power, they both durst and would do their office.[1] The Lord President Seton spoke as became his dignified place. "My liege, it is my part to speak first in this court, of which your Highness has made me head. You are our king; we your subjects, bound and ready to obey you from the heart, and with all devotion to serve you with our lives and substance; but this is a matter of law, in which we are sworn to do justice according to our conscience and the statutes of the realm. Your Majesty may indeed command us to the contrary, in which case I and every honest man on the bench will either vote against conscience, or resign and not vote at all." This was nobly spoken. Judgment was given in favour of Bruce; and the mortified monarch flung out of court, "muttering revenge, and raging marvellously."[2]

James was ambitious of literary fame, and more especially of being considered an authority on matters of king-craft. In 1598 he published his "Law of Free Monarchies;" and amidst all the distractions of his contest with the Church, he found time to compose his "Basilicon Doron, or Instructions to his Dearest Son Henry, the Prince." He permitted only seven copies of this work to be printed—the printer being first sworn to secrecy—and these he distributed among his trustiest servants, to be closely kept by them, and carefully preserved. Sir James Sempill, one of these trusty servants, showed his copy to Andrew Melville. Andrew Melville extracted some propositions from the work, and sent them to his nephew James Melville. James Melville showed them to his colleague at Anstruther, John Dykes; and John Dykes covertly brought a copy before the Synod of Fife—a roundabout and underhand

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. v. p. 733.

[2] Tytler's History, vol. ix.

course.[1] Among the propositions presented to the synod were the following:—The office of a king is a mixed office betwixt the civil and ecclesiastical estate: the king should be judge if a minister wander from his text: no man is more to be hated of a king than a proud puritan: parity amongst ministers cannot agree with a monarchy: without bishops the three Estates in parliament cannot be re-established: the ministers sought to establish a democracy in the land, and to become *tribuni plebis* themselves: the ministers' quarrel was ever against the king, for no other cause but because he was a king.[2] The propositions thus stealthily laid upon the table were anonymous; the synod affected to be ignorant of their author, and condemned them. All this was done under the eyes of two royal commissioners who were present in the court. At first they were completely baffled in their endeavours to discover how the propositions had been obtained, but when the truth began to ooze out, Dykes thought it prudent to abscond.

James now felt that he had no alternative but to publish his work, and he did so. Amid some puerilities it contains many wise and virtuous maxims, and is undoubtedly the most creditable of the royal author's productions. James was a believer in the divine right of kings, and the duty of passive obedience on the part of the people; but he does not put these doctrines offensively forward. The passage at which umbrage was taken occurs in the second book, where, speaking of the Reformation, and the events which followed, he alludes to the party in the Church who had kept him in a continual whirl of alarm and agitation. "Take heed, therefore, my son," he says, "to such puritans, very pests in the Church and Commonwealth, whom no deserts can oblige, neither oaths or promises bind, breathing nothing but sedition and calumnies, aspersing without measure, railing without reason, and making their own imaginations (without any warrant of the Word) the square of their consciences. I protest before the great God, and, since I am here, upon my Testament, it is no place for me to lie in, that you shall never find with any highland or border thieves greater ingratitude, and more lies and vile perjuries, than with these fanatic spirits. And suffer not the principles of them to brook your land, if you like to sit at rest;

---

[1] Melville's Diary, p. 294. Spottiswood, lib. vi. Calderwood, vol. v. M'Crie's Life of Melville.

[2] Melville's Diary, p. 295. Melville calls them "Anglopiscopapistical propositions."

unless you would keep them for trying your patience, as Socrates did an evil wife. And for preservation against their poison, entertain and advance the godly, learned, and modest men of the ministry, of whom (God be praised) there lacketh not a sufficient number, and by their provision to bishoprics and benefices (annulling that vile act of annexation if you find it not done to your hand), you shall not only banish their conceited parity whereof I have spoken, and their other imaginary grounds which can neither stand with the order of a Church nor the peace of a Commonwealth and well-ruled monarchy; but you shall also re-establish the old institution of Three Estates in Parliament, which can no otherwise be done. But in this, I hope, if God spare me days, to make you a fair entry; always where I leave, follow you my steps. And to end my advice anent the Church Estate, cherish no man more than a good pastor, hate no man more than a proud puritan; thinking it one of your fairest styles to be called a loving nourish-father to the Church."[1]

The king, like meaner authors, has a "Prefactory Epistle to the Charitable Reader," which he begins with the text "there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed," and then, alluding to the underhand production of the propositions, he says that he was thus forced to publish the entire book, "for resisting the malice of the children of envy, who like wasps, suck venom out of every wholesome herb." Knowing that what he had said about puritans was what had galled most, he declares, by way of apology, "that he meant by puritans the Anabaptists and Brownists, and not the ministers who preferred the simple worship of their own Church to the more ornate ritual of the south."[2] We are bound in charity to believe what James so earnestly protests; but, apart from this, enough remained to give deep cause of offence to many, and to reveal to all that it was the king's settled purpose to reintroduce Episcopacy into the Church. In England, if we may believe Spottiswood, the book was so well received, as to have smoothed the royal author's path to the throne; in Scotland, if we may believe Bowes, the English ambassador, it produced an opposite effect. A fast was proclaimed; for two whole days it was rigorously kept; and Bowes declares to Cecil that he had never witnessed a more holy or powerful practice in religion.[3]

---

[1] Basilicon Doron, book ii. pp. 160, 161.

[2] Epistle to the Reader prefixed to the Basilicon Doron, King James's Works, p. 143.

[3] Spottiswood, lib. vi. Tytler, vol. ix.

In the month of October the king and the Church were brought into collision by a company of comedians, whom his Majesty had invited from England to his northern capital. Fletcher was at the head of this strolling band of players, and some have fondly imagined that William Shakspeare was one of the company.[1] James was a lover of theatricals, and several comedies were performed at the palace in his presence. When the king was wearied with their fun, the comedians purchased from him a warrant to the magistrates of Edinburgh, to find them a house within the town for performing their plays. All things being ready, "they gave warning by trumpets and drums through the streets of the city to all that pleased to come to the Blackfriars' Wynd, to see the acting of their comedies." The clergy took alarm; the four sessions were convoked; an act was made, and intimated from the pulpit, forbidding the people to resort to these profane plays; and the poor players found that their occupation was gone. The king was highly incensed when he heard of this, as he regarded the act of the sessions as made to cross his royal warrant, and therefore he had the ministers and elders forthwith summoned into his presence. Their explanations were regarded as unsatisfactory, and on the next day a proclamation was published by sound of trumpet, charging them to meet and rescind the obnoxious act. The sessions convened, the opinion of counsel was taken, the ministers stood firm, but the elders outvoted them, and the act was annulled. Thus the inhabitants of Edinburgh had free liberty to resort to the Blackfriars' Wynd and enjoy the modern drama, now that the Mysteries and Moralities of the Church, and the frolics of Robin Hood and Little John, had fallen into disuse.[2]

A.D. 1600.

The first year of the seventeenth century was destined to see Scotch presbyters raised to the dignity of Members of Parliament. The General Assembly met at Montrose on the 18th of March. It was designed to complete the revolutionary work which had been begun at Perth and Dundee, and therefore the uncompromising Presbyterians, and their more courtly brethren, looked forward to it with equal anxiety. The north once more appeared in great strength. The king himself came to Montrose to meet with the ministers, and join in their discussions with all the keen-

---

[1] See Statistical Account, vol. xviii. p. 523.

[2] Calderwood, vol. v. pp. 765-67. Tytler, vol. ix. Nicolson to Cecil, Nov. 12. Proclamation by King, &c. Cal. of State Papers.

ness of a thorough-bred polemic. His apartments were constantly crowded with clergymen, who came either to make their court or to be courted. From the time he rose in the morning till he went to bed at night, he was so busy with ministers that the courtiers complained they could not get access to him. It had already been decided at Dundee that ministers might vote in parliament as the representatives of the Church ; but many specialties required to be arranged to give to this general proposition a substantive shape. At a meeting of Commissioners of Synods held at Falkland, a number of resolutions had been discussed and agreed upon ; and at a conference of ministers in Holyrood House, under the auspices of the king, the subject had been long and earnestly debated in all its bearings.

The whole matter was now brought before the supreme court of the Church to receive its sanction. The first subject to be decided regarded the election and maintenance of those who were to have vote in parliament ; and, after some discussion, it was resolved—that the Church should recommend to his Majesty a list of six ministers for every vacant place, and that out of these his Majesty should choose one to sit in parliament ; and that after churches, colleges, and schools were sufficiently provided for, the remainder of any Episcopal benefices might be given by the king to the ministers who had been raised to parliamentary honours.

This being resolved upon, the Assembly proceeded to heap *caveats* upon its parliamentary representatives. Never was member for a burgh more loaded with pledges and promises than were these members for the Church with what were called *caveats* or *cautions*. They were to propose nothing in name of the Church without its express warrant ; they were to render to every General Assembly an account of the way in which they had discharged their commission ; they were to content themselves with so much of their benefice as was assigned them by his Majesty ; they were not to dilapidate their benefice ; they were to discharge every pastoral duty to their respective congregations ; they were not to usurp any jurisdiction over their brethren ; they were to remain subject to the censures of the Church Courts ; they were to swear to all this at their admission ; and, in case of their deposition from the ministry, their seat in parliament and their benefice were *ipso facto* to become vacant.[1]

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1600. Calderwood, vol. vi. pp. 1-20.

It was warmly debated as to whether these parliament-men should hold their seats for life, or only from year to year. A middle course was at length agreed upon. Every year they were to give an account of their stewardship to the Assembly, and lay down their commission at its feet, to be continued or discontinued as the Assembly, with the consent of his Majesty, might think most expedient for the welfare of the Church. Another nice point which this Assembly had to solve was the name to be borne by its parliamentary representatives. The Estates had determined that they could be received only as abbots and bishops, the heirs of their Popish ancestors. To be an abbot, even in name, was a thing abhorrent to every Presbyterian; to be a bishop almost as bad. It was resolved they should be called Commissioners, and in case the Estates would not receive them under that appellation, that a future Assembly would reconsider it. "Thus," says Calderwood, mournfully, "the Trojan horse—the Episcopacy—was brought in, busked and covered with caveats, that the danger and deformity might not be seen; which was, notwithstanding, seen of many and opposed unto. But force and falsehood prevailed."[1]

Nothing now remained to be done but to fill up the vacant bishoprics. Aberdeen and Argyll were already filled by ministers; Dunkeld, Brechin, and Dunblane were held by titulars, not ministers; St Andrews and Glasgow were in possession of the Duke of Lennox; Galloway and the Isles were so dilapidated, that nothing was left. Only Ross and Caithness remained to be disposed of. David Lyndsay was presented to the first, and George Gladstone to the second.[2]

The autumn of this year is memorable for the Gowrie Conspiracy, over which there still hangs an air of impenetrable mystery. The king was cajoled to Gowrie House, at Perth, by Alexander Ruthven, brother of the Earl of Gowrie, where, instead of seeing a Spanish Jesuit in a black cloak, as he had expected, he beheld a man in armour with a dagger in his belt. The man stood dumb and then shuffled out of the room, but Ruthven threatened the king with death for his father's execution. James got to the window and bawled, "treason! help!" and some of his attendants forced their way

---

[1] History, vol. vi. p. 20. The Trojan horse was a favourite figure. James Melville gives us a snatch of poetry, in which the same similitude is worked out.

[2] Spottiswood, lib. vi.

to the room, killed both Gowrie and his brother, and rescued the king, who was unhurt, but terribly frightened. A letter from his Majesty made his good subjects, the citizens of Edinburgh, aware of all this by ten o'clock the next morning ; and requested the ministers to have the Church bells rung, the people assembled, and thanks given to God for his delivery. The ministers, somehow, were sceptical about the whole matter, and declared that if they went to the pulpit, whatever they might say, they would be silent about treason. The remonstrances of the Privy Council failed to move them, and there was nothing for it but that David Lyndsay, the new Bishop of Ross, should go to the market cross, and make a harangue to the people. When it was done, the whole multitude uncovered and praised God ; the bells of the churches rung ; the cannons of the castle thundered forth their joy ; and when darkness set in the city was illuminated, and bonfires blazed on the top of Arthur's Seat, on Fawside Hill, and other eminences, both on the north and south of the Firth.[1]

Upon Monday, the 11th of August, James returned to his capital, and the citizens, to testify their joy, turned out in arms to receive him. The market cross was covered with tapestry, and at it the royal procession paused. Patrick Galloway preached a sermon, embodying a narrative of the conspiracy, to the crowd of courtiers and burghers who thronged around him ; and the king made a speech, corroborating what had been said by the preacher. The next day the unbelieving ministers were cited by a macer to appear before the Secret Council. They came, and were questioned by the king himself, but they were still sceptical ; and while declaring their readiness to give thanks for the king's escape in general terms, they stoutly declined to enter into particulars. Had James consulted his interest and his dignity, he would have left them alone in their unbelief ; but he let his annoyance get the better of his discretion, and banished Bruce, Balcanquhal, Balfour, Watson, and Hall, from Edinburgh, and interdicted them from preaching anywhere in his dominions. The sentence was utterly unjustifiable, but it had the effect of convincing Balcanquhal, Balfour, Watson, and Hall ; who, after publicly confessing their conversion to the truth, were restored to their churches. Bruce remained obstinate, and was banished to France, but in exile conviction began to dawn upon

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. vi. p. 46.

his mind too, and he was on the eve of being restored when new disagreements led to his final banishment from Edinburgh.[1]

It is now as certain as most historical facts that the Earl of Gowrie and his brother had conspired—not to murder the king, but to get him into their power, and thus to control the government; but James's notorious timidity, the death of the two principal conspirators, with the secret in their bosoms, the discrepancies in the narratives that were afloat, the strangeness of the whole story, made many besides the ministers disbelieve, and even led some to fancy that it was a conspiracy of the king against the Ruthvens, and not of the Ruthvens against the king.[2]

The man who could scarcely look upon a drawn sword without shuddering, must have felt devoutly thankful when delivered from a dagger pointed at his heart; but he foolishly expected all men, and all future ages, to be as thankful as himself, when he changed the weekly preaching from Friday to Tuesday in memory of the event, and ordained that in all time coming the 5th of August should be held as a day of solemn thanksgiving for his miraculous deliverance. This was a near approach to an apotheosis. The Church of Scotland did not keep saints' days, but in its present obliging humour, it agreed to keep the king's day.[3] But it was not long till the calendar was changed.

Before the sixteenth century expired, many of the ministers of the Church, who had borne a conspicuous part in the Reformation struggles, ceased from their warfare to enter upon their reward. In 1598 Thomas Buchanan, provost of Kirkheugh and minister of Cyprus, was killed by a fall from his horse. In 1599 Principal Rollock of Edinburgh died, still a young man, but already distinguished for his learning, moderation, and services to the Church. In 1600 stout John Dury breathed his last, a man whom all parties appear to have respected for his simple piety and straightforward honesty; and in the same year John Craig, long the colleague of Knox, and whose life in youth was strangely chequered by stirring incidents and hairbreadth escapes, rested from his labours.[4]

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. vi. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] The curious in this matter are referred to Burton's History, chaps. lxi. and lxiii., and to Pitcairn's Criminal Trials.

[3] Book of the Universal Kirk, Assembly 1602, p. 526. Calderwood, vol. vi.

[4] Spottiswood's History, lib. vi.

The name of Principal Rollock bids us pause and record the foundation of the University of Edinburgh. No papal bull gave privileges and immunities to this celebrated seat of learning, as had been the case with St Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen. The reverence for the Pope had departed before the metropolitan university had a being. Immediately after the Reformation, however, the magistrates resolved to apply some of the ecclesiastical spoil which had come into their hands toward the erection of a college, and the kirk of St-Mary-in-the-Fields was bought from its last provost for a site. In 1580 the building was begun; two years afterwards, a charter of erection was obtained from James VI., ratifying the previous grants of his mother; and in 1583 students were enrolled to be taught Humanity by Rollock, at first the only professor of whom the College could boast. When other professors were added, Rollock was raised to the principality. The academy thus poorly begun flourished mightily. Regents were appointed, public disputations were held, students were laureated; and when King James came from England to revisit his native country in 1617, he was so proud of the school which he had helped to rear that he desired that it should be called by his name.[1]

A.D. 1601. The Assembly met at Burntisland in May 1601. It exhibited the same zeal as all former Assemblies against Popery; but the most interesting part of its proceedings related to the Bible and Psalm-book. It was brought before the notice of the Assembly, that in the translation of the Scriptures then in use there were many errors which might be corrected; that in the metrical version of the Psalms there were many lines that might be improved; and that in the liturgy there were several prayers which ought to be changed, to meet the change of times. This was a subject upon which the poetic and theological monarch was sure to shine. He pointed out the errors in the vulgar translation of the Bible; he recited verse after verse of the Psalms; he expatiated upon their divergence from the original, and the faults of their metre; and the Assembly listened with wonder and joy. It was finally agreed that the brethren best acquainted with the original languages should devote their energies to different parts of the sacred text, and bring the result of their labours before a future Assembly; and that any brother might prepare and propose new prayers, suited to the

---

[1] Stevenson's Chronicles of Edinburgh.

times, to be added to the liturgy, but that no alteration should be made in those already contained in it.[1]

James was now beginning to look anxiously forward to his accession to the English throne. Elizabeth's health was beginning to decline, and it was plain that the sceptre must soon depart from her, notwithstanding the firmness with which she had held it for so long a period. It was the policy of James to conciliate all classes of his subjects, present and future; and such middle courses, though sometimes the best that can be followed, are never entirely successful. The Protestants bitterly blamed him for the marks of favour which he gave to the Romanists. The Countess of Huntly, a Papist, was a great favourite at court; Lady Livingston, a Papist, had the charge of the Princess Elizabeth; the sister of the Laird of Bonnington, a Papist too, was frequently at Holyrood. These were sore evils in the eye of the Church. It was even affirmed that in 1596 James had written a courteous letter to the Pope, proposing the residence of a Scottish ambassador at the court of Rome. When challenged for this apparent apostasy, he strongly denied it; and when the letter was afterwards produced, with the royal signature attached, Lord Balmerino, the Scottish Secretary of State, and a Catholic, stepped forward and declared that he had surreptitiously got it signed, with a number of other papers which the king did not read; but many believed that the secretary took the paternity of the document to save the character of his royal master.[2] Notwithstanding these concessions, the millions of Papists in the heart of England were not entirely reconciled to the prospect of another Protestant monarch, and more than one brain was busily plotting a change in the line of succession.

On Thursday the 24th of March 1603, Queen Elizabeth breathed her last, and late on Saturday night James was raised from his bed to be greeted as King of England, France, and Ireland. Two days afterwards official news of his peaceable accession to the English throne reached Edinburgh. He instantly began to make preparations for his journey to the south. On Sunday the 3d of April, he repaired to St Gile's for the last time to hear sermon. Hall was the preacher for the day, and took occasion in his sermon to remember the mercies of God towards his Majesty, not the least of which, he remarked, was his peaceable accession to the throne of Eng-

---

[1] Book of the Universal Kirk, pp. 497, 498. Spottiswood, lib. vi.

[2] Tytler, vol. ix. Calderwood, vol. vi.

land. When the sermon was done, the king rose up and delivered his farewell speech. He complimented the preacher; he remarked of himself that he was the lineal heir of the crown of England as well as of the crown of Scotland; he declared his love for his Scotch subjects would not be lessened though he was removed from them. "There is no more difference," said the royal orator, "between London and Edinburgh, than between Edinburgh and Aberdeen; for all our marches are dry, and there are ferries between them. But my course must be to establish peace, and religion, and wealth betwixt both countries; and as God has joined the right of both kingdoms in my person, so you may be joined in wealth, in religion, in heart, and affections. And as the one country has wealth, and the other has multitude of men, so we may part the gifts, and every one, as they can, help the other. And as God has promoted me to a greater power than I had, so I must endeavour myself to flourish and establish religion, and take away the corruptions of both countries. And, on the other part, you must not doubt but as I have a body as able as any king in Europe, whereby I am able to travel, so I shall visit you every three years at the least, that I may with mine own mouth take account of justice, and of them that are under me, and that you yourselves may see and hear me, and from the meanest to the greatest may have access to my person, and may pour out your complaints in my bosom."[1] In a few days more the king had crossed the border, to be met by the loud acclamations and hearty welcome of the English people.

CHAPTER XV.

WHEN James was making his triumphal progress to London, the Puritans, expecting to find favour with a Puritan king, met him on the way, and presented to him their millenary petition, so called because it was said to be signed by a thousand ministers. In consequence of this, and probably also to exhibit his own theological attainments, the monarch determined to hold a conference at Hampton Court, of the two parties who divided the English Church. Nine bishops, seven deans, and an archdeacon, were nominated to represent the High Church party; four ministers to state the views of the Puritans.

---

[1] Calderwood, vol. v. p. 215.

They met on the 14th January 1604. The conference continued three days. The first was with the bishops and deans alone, when the king made a speech, saying, "that he was now come into the promised land: that he sat among grave and reverend men, and was not a king, as formerly, without state, nor in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face." The second day's conference was held on the 16th of January, when the four Puritan ministers were called in on the one side, and two bishops and six or eight deans on the other. Patrick Galloway, the minister of Perth, was also permitted to be present. Dr Reynolds of Cambridge, in name of his Puritanic brethren, humbly craved that some alterations might be made in the doctrines, government, and services of the Church. James no longer thought the Kirk of Scotland the purest Kirk in Christendom. He declared the surplice to be a comely garment, and the sign of the cross as old as Constantine; "and as to the power of the Church," said he, "in things indifferent, I will not argue that point with you, but answer as kings in parliament, '*le Roi s'avisera.*' This is like Mr John Black, a beardless boy, who told me at the last conference in Scotland, that he would hold conformity with me in doctrine, but that every man, as to ceremonies, was to be left to his own liberty; but I will have none of that: I will have one doctrine one discipline, one religion in substance and ceremony; never speak more to that point, how far you are bound to obey." Dr Reynolds proceeded to complain of excommunication by lay chancellors; and to desire that the clergy might have liberty to hold periodical meetings; but at this all the king's bitter reminiscences of Scotch presbyteries, synods, and General Assemblies, rose up before him, and he sharply told the Puritan ministers, that he saw they were aiming at a Scotch Presbytery, "which," said his Majesty, "agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil; then Jack and Tom, Will and Dick, shall meet, and at their pleasure censure both me and my Council. Therefore, pray stay one seven years before you demand that of me, and if then you find me pursy and fat, and my windpipe stuffed, I will perhaps hearken to you; for let that government be up, and I am sure I shall be kept in breath; but till you find I grow lazy, pray let that alone. I remember how they used the poor lady my mother in Scotland, and me in my minority." Then turning to the bishops, he put his hand to his hat and said, "My lords, I may thank you that these Puritans plead for my supremacy, for if once

you are out and they in place, I know what would become of my supremacy, *for no bishop, no king*."[1]

The third day was chiefly occupied with the bishops and deans, and the king spoke so much in harmony with their feelings, that the old archbishop cried out, "undoubtedly your Majesty speaks by the special assistance of God's Spirit." The Puritans were only called in for a little to hear the few trifling alterations which had been agreed upon. The bishops and deans exulted at this issue of the conference, and pronounced James to be the Solomon of his age, and to unite in his one person the priest and the king. James himself was exalted above measure at the part he had played. He wrote to Scotland that he had soundly peppered the Puritans, and that they had fled before him. "It were no reason," said his Majesty, aiming at a pun, "that those who refuse the airy sign of the cross after baptism, should have their purses stuffed with any more solid and substantial *crosses*. They fled me so from argument to argument, without ever answering me directly, that I was forced to tell them, that if any of them when boys had disputed thus in the college, the moderator would have fetched them up, and applied the rod to their buttocks." Thus wrote the king of such men as Dr Reynolds, one of the lights of the age. But the Puritan party throughout the country felt that they had been mocked, and complained loudly that justice had not been done to them. The Presbyterians in Scotland sympathised with them, and when Patrick Galloway's narrative of the conference was read in the Presbytery of Edinburgh, James Melville moved that prayer should be offered up for their comfort and relief, and that care should be taken lest Scotland should catch the contagion of English superstition.[2]

One good result came of the conference. Acting on a hint thrown out by Dr Reynolds, the king resolved to have a new translation of the Bible; and by the united labours of forty-seven of the most learned men in England, the present authorised version was compiled, and gradually came into use. It is now used wherever the English language is spoken, alike by churchman and dissenter. A few years later and this had been impossible; sectarian jealousy would have prevented it, and every sect would have had its own Bible as it has its own hymn-book and catechism.

---

[1] Neal's History, vol. i. pp. 414-17.

[2] Neal's History, vol. i. pp. 417-19. Calderwood's History, vol. vi.

The General Assembly had been indited to meet at Aberdeen on the last Tuesday of July, but the king prorogued it till the following year. Notwithstanding the prorogation, the Presbytery of St Andrews, ever faithful to its principles and its leaders, determined to keep the diet on the appointed day; and, accordingly, James Melville, William Erskine, and William Murray appeared as its commissioners in the Church of St Nicholas at Aberdeen, true to the time; and, finding no other commissioners there, they publicly protested, and took instruments in the hands of their notaries that they had appeared, and that if the Church suffered skaith through the not keeping of the Assembly, it was not to be imputed to them or their presbytery.[1] The bad feeling excited by this stretch of the royal prerogative, in defiance of the many laws which guaranteed an annual Assembly, was increased by the circumstance, that James was at that moment using every endeavour to effect a union between the kingdoms. The Church was patriotic and far-seeing enough devoutly to desire this; but it dreaded that the Anglican episcopate and ritual might be extended to Scotland, and that the General Assembly was prorogued to prevent its remonstrances.

As the month of July 1605—when the General Assembly was to meet—approached, the old Presbyterian spirit began to revive, and it was rumoured throughout the country that an effort would be made to undo the legislation of the last eight years.[2] The court took alarm, and in the month of June, when many of the presbyteries had already elected their representatives, a circular-letter was sent them, signed by Sir Alexander Straiton, the Royal Commissioner, and Patrick Galloway, the Moderator of last Assembly, requesting them to stay their representatives from keeping the diet.[3] This letter had the effect of keeping the great majority of the Church's commissioners at home. Dread of the consequence of disobedience, anxiety for peace, dislike of being mixed up in a quarrel, operated then, as they always do, except in times of violent excitement.

On the 2d of July only nineteen ministers appeared at Aberdeen. Straiton of Lauriston came too, and presented to them a letter from the Lords of the Secret Council. As this letter was addressed—"To our trusty friends, the brethren of the ministry convened at their Assembly at Aberdeen," it was agreed that it

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 264-68.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii.

[3] Forbes's Records, p. 384, Wodrow Ed. Calderwood's History, vol. vi.

could not be read till a Moderator was appointed. Straiton declined being present at the election, but, before leaving, he suggested Forbes of Alford, and in compliance with his wishes, Forbes was chosen. The letter was then read, and it charged them instantly to dissolve, and that without fixing any day for their next meeting till they had first consulted his Majesty.[1] The ministers proved their moderation by resolving to adjourn without despatching a single piece of business, but to adjourn without fixing the time of their next meeting was to surrender a principle which was a part of their religion—a principle which had been secured to them by law, and upon which they believed depended the continued existence of their Church. They therefore framed a respectful letter to the Secret Council, explaining their conduct, and then adjourned, to meet again on the last Tuesday of September. When this resolution was come to, the Royal Commissioner, foiled of his principal purpose, protested that he did not acknowledge their meeting for a lawful Assembly; upon which the Moderator made counter-protestation that it was and behoved to be a lawful Assembly, in respect of their warrant to meet, the laws of the land, and the continual custom of the Kirk. Straiton now took a more violent step, and charged the ministers, by a messenger, forthwith to depart, under pain of horning. The Assembly protested that they were ready instantly to obey the tenor of the charge, and so quietly dispersed.[2]

The Laird of Lauriston appears to have been aware that the fact of the Assembly having been constituted and adjourned to a future day would give deep cause of offence to the king and his bishops, and therefore, on his return to Edinburgh, he declared to the Council that, by proclamation at the market-cross, on the evening preceding the day on which the Assembly was to convene, he had forbidden it to meet, a statement which the ministers vehemently denied, and which his own conduct appears to refute. In consequence of this statement, John Forbes, who had acted as Moderator of the dissolved Assembly, John Welsh, a son-in-law of Knox, and several other ministers, were cited before the Council, either for having been present at the Assembly, or for having approved of its proceedings, and sent prisoners to Blackness. The mass of the people were indignant at this unjustifiable severity. The preachers preached against it, and the populace talked against it. The

---

[1] Forbes's Records, p. 388. Calderwood, vol. vi.

[2] Forbes's Records, pp. 392-94. Calderwood, vol. vi.

Council thought to check this by issuing two proclamations—the one discharging presbyteries from appointing commissioners to the adjourned Assembly, and the other prohibiting all Church Courts and ministers, in public or in private, from approving of the proceedings of the ministers at Aberdeen. But it is difficult to stifle free thought. James Melville wrote an able apology for the imprisoned ministers. The imprisoned ministers themselves directed a respectful letter to the king, vindicating their conduct. Public indignation rose higher, and James felt it necessary to publish a proclamation, setting forth, that although it was desirable that as much uniformity as possible should exist between the united kingdoms, he did not intend to make any sudden innovations on the civil or ecclesiastical institutions of Scotland, and appointing a General Assembly to be held at Dundee on the last Tuesday of July.[1]

On the 24th of October, fourteen ministers were brought before the Secret Council; and when called to answer for their conduct, they gave in a written declinature of the jurisdiction of the court. The Council repelled the declinature, declared the Assembly to have been unlawful, and those who had met in it to be subject to punishment. A fortnight after this, on the 5th of November, the English parliament was to have met; but that day was rendered for ever memorable by the discovery of the gunpowder treason; the first news of which carried agitation and alarm throughout the kingdom. While James and his courtiers were congratulating themselves on their escape from the plots of the Papists, Forbes and his Presbyterian brethren were languishing in prison. The king had unpleasant recollections about declinatures in the days of his weakness; and now when he was strong he resolved to have his revenge. He sent down directions to have Forbes, Welsh, Duncan, Sharp, Dury, and Strachan tried for treason.[2]

On the 10th of January 1606, they were brought up for trial before the Justice-Depute, assisted by several of the nobility, the indictment being laid upon the Act 1584, touching his Majesty's jurisdiction over all Estates. After a legal argument, it was decided by the judges, that to decline the judgment of the Council was treason—the Earl of Marr, Lord Holyroodhouse, and John Preston, dissenting.[3] A jury was now empanelled; and it was carefully explained to them by

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. Spottiswood's History, lib. vii.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vi.

[3] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. p. 379.

the king's advocate, that the only question which they had to decide was, whether or not the indicted ministers had declined the jurisdiction of the Council, and that their own signatures to the declinature placed the fact beyond all controversy. The jury had been packed by the Crown; they were threatened and brow-beat by the Justice-Clerk and the advocate; the fact of the ministers having declined the jurisdiction of the Council was certain; and yet so strong was the sense of the injustice that was about to be perpetrated, that six out of the fifteen jurymen refused, after six hours' consultation, to bring in a verdict of guilty.[1]

On the 9th of July, the parliament assembled at Perth. It was customary at this period for the nobles to ride in state to their place of meeting, clothed in their scarlet robes of office. Ten bishops were in the cavalcade on the first day of this parliament, taking their place betwixt the earls and lords. First came the two archbishops, Gladstone and Spottiswood; and by the stirrup of Gladstone walked an Angusshire minister, of tall stature, with his cap in hand. Next to them rode the Bishops of Dunkeld and Galloway; next, the Bishops of Ross and Dunblane; next, the Bishops of Moray and Caithness; and last of all, the Bishops of Orkney and the Isles. Blackburn, the Bishop of Aberdeen, thought such pomp unbecoming the simplicity of a minister, and walked to parliament on foot.[2]

The chief business of the parliament was to set up the state of bishops, with all its ancient rents and privileges, and to erect a number of prelacies into temporal lordships. A paction had been made between the bishops and the lords: the bishops were to give their consent to the erection of the prelacies into temporal lordships; and the lords were to lend their help to resuscitate the ancient bishoprics.[3] An act was first passed declaring the king to be supreme over all persons and causes; and after it followed an act for the restitution of the Estate of bishops. The statute proceeds upon the preamble, that, though his Majesty was no longer present

---

[1] Forbes's Records, Wod. Ed. Calderwood's History, vol. vi. Cook's History of the Church, vol. ii. There is still extant a letter, written by Sir Thomas Hamilton, the advocate, to the king, on the day on which the sentence was passed, in which he mentions the difficulties with which he had to struggle, and the infamous methods he was obliged to employ to procure the condemnation of the ministers, and expressing a devout wish he should have no more such work to do.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 492, 493.

[3] Calderwood's History, vol. vi.

with his Scottish subjects, absence had not bred in his royal mind oblivion of their good, and that, anxious to maintain justice and religion as the pillars of the kingdom, and to preserve the ancient policy of the Three Estates, which had been unwittingly all but destroyed by the Act of Annexation, he now, with the consent of the Estates, retracted, rescinded, reduced, cassed, abrogated, and annulled said act — and reponed, restored, and reintegrated the Estate of bishops to their ancient and accustomed honour, dignities, prerogatives, privileges, livings, lands, teinds, rents, thirds, and estate. It was specially declared, however, that this act was to extend only to bishoprics, and was not to affect those other benefices which his Majesty, in his princely liberality, had bestowed upon his faithful servants, and which were now anew confirmed to them. Another act was passed to prevent the dilapidation of bishoprics in future.[1] The parliament did not close with the same Episcopal pomp as that with which it was opened; for the bishops were no sooner restored to their ancient estate than they quarrelled about their proper place in the procession, maintaining they were entitled to take precedence of earls, and to ride after the marquises; and rather than yield the point, they resolved not to join in the procession at all, but to proceed to the parliament on foot.[2]

They had afterwards to fight a more serious battle than this one about precedence, for the ecclesiastical revenues which this parliament gave them. The lay possessors would not loosen their grip; processes at law were slow and uncertain; there were districts of the country where decreets of the courts were set at defiance, and the lean prelates could only complain to the king of their hard fate—compelled to keep an Episcopal state without the means of doing it.[3]

The six ministers who had been convicted of treason were still in prison awaiting their doom: it might be death. But James, though despotic, was not cruel, and he resolved to make an effort to reclaim the irreclaimable Presbyterians of the north. Full of the triumphant memories of his victory over the Puritans, he resolved to send for some of the best-

---

[1] Acts of the Scottish Parliament, James VI., parl. xviii. chapters ii. iii.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. p. 493. There is still extant a letter from the Archbishop of St Andrews to the king, dated 20th July 1607, in which his Grace asks his Majesty to give instructions as to the precedence of the archbishops and bishops.

[3] Original Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Affairs (Ban. Club). See also Burton's History, chap. lxv.

known Scottish ministers to court, that amidst the glare of royal and Episcopal splendour they might be brought to reason. So early as the month of March, a royal missive had been directed to eight ministers, including the two Melvilles, requesting their presence at London in September; and at the same time five of the Scotch bishops were ordered to be in attendance, as the representatives of the opposite party in the Church.

Sept. 20, 1606.

On their arrival in London, the Scotch ministers were waited upon by the Dean of Salisbury, and on the 20th of the month conducted to Hampton Court, where they immediately got presence, and were permitted to kiss the king's hand. The king had just dined—he had not swallowed the last mouthful—and was in high good-humour. He joked with Mr Balfour about his long beard, asked about the progress of the plague in Edinburgh, and dismissed the ministers with smiles. The dean, who was still their attendant, took them to dinner, and before parting with them, requested them to be present on the following day in the king's chapel to hear sermon. They came, and were conducted into a pew by themselves, close by the pulpit. The king, queen, and nobles were there, and Barlow, Bishop of Lincoln, was the preacher. He chose his text from Acts xx. 28, "Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers," and toiled to prove the supremacy of bishops above presbyters, and the inconvenience of parity. On the 22d of the month they were again sent for to speak to his Majesty after dinner. On their arrival they were courteously received by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and soon afterwards the king entered the presence chamber, followed by a train of Scotch nobles and bishops. James made a long speech, chiefly bearing upon the Assembly at Aberdeen, and his desire to have a legal and peaceable Assembly to set all things in order. According to arrangement, James Melville answered in a respectful manner, but avoiding any explicit declaration of opinion on the controverted points.[1]

On the day following they were again brought to chapel, and heard Dr Buckridge, the Bishop of Rochester, preach from Romans xiii. 1, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," from which he attempted to show that the

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. p. 567. Spottiswood, lib. vii.

king was supreme in ecclesiastical as well as in civil causes, and made odious comparisons between the Pope and Presbytery, as being equally opposed to princes. After dinner they were again brought into the royal presence. The king asked whether or not they justified the conventicle at Aberdeen, as he was pleased to call it. The Scotch bishops one by one condemned it; but when it came to Andrew Melville, he reasoned that it had sufficient authority in the Word of God and the laws of the realm. The other ministers followed in the same strain. Reference being made to the trial of the six ministers for treason, Melville turned upon the advocate, who was present, and accused him of favouring Papists and persecuting the ministers of Christ. "And still, my lord," said he, "you show yourself possessed of the same spirit; for not content with having pleaded against them in Scotland, you still continue *ὁ κατηγορος των αδελφων*." At this phrase the king turned to the Archbishop of Canterbury and exclaimed, "What's that he said? I think he calls him Antichrist. Nay, by God, it is the devil's name in the Revelation of their well-beloved John!"[1]

On Sunday, the 28th of September, they were again brought to the king's chapel to hear Dr Andrews, Bishop of Chichester, discourse from the Book of Numbers, upon the silver trumpets which were blown by the Jews at their solemn convocations; from which the ingenious divine undertook to prove that it belonged to emperors and kings to convene and discharge ecclesiastical assemblies. Next day was St Michael's Day, and again the Scotch ministers were conducted to their accustomed pew in the chapel. No sermon was preached on this high day; but on the altar were laid two closed books, two empty chalices, two candlesticks with unlighted candles; and the king and queen, devoutly approaching it, presented their offerings. On the day following they were yet again required to be present, to hear Dr King, Dean of Christ's Church, discourse from the 8th chapter of Solomon's Song, and demonstrating from the vineyard which Solomon had at Baalhamon, and which he let out to keepers, that lay elders had no place or office in the church.[2] Here ended the lessons

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. p. 577. The story is sometimes told a little differently. According to one version the Earl of Northampton asked the king what Melville had called the Lord Advocate. "He called him the *meikle devil*," replied the king.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood's History, vol. vi.

for the Scotch ministers. When James resolved to put them through this course of controversial divinity, he must have fancied they would have been overawed by the authority, and silenced by the arguments of the English dignataries. It was perhaps well meant, but it was very farcical; and it is a marvel that Melville, considering his imperious temper, bore it with patience.

More than once after this the ministers were called before the members of the Scotch Privy Council, who were present in London, and harassed with questions as to the Aberdeen Assembly, and as to whether or not they sympathised with and prayed for the six ministers who had been convicted of treason. They strongly protested against this treatment as illegal and unjust, and craved to be allowed to return to their native country; but this was denied them. It was becoming too plain that the king, having failed to convert them, was now seeking an occasion against them. They who seek opportunities generally find them. On St Michael's Day, after returning from the chapel, Andrew Melville had amused himself by writing a Latin epigram upon what he had seen:—

"Cur stant clausi Anglis libri duo regia in ara,
Lumina cæca duo, pollubra sicca duo?
Num sensum cultumque Dei tenet Anglia clausum,
Lumine cæca suo, sorde sepulta sua?
Romano an ritu dum regalem instruit aram,
Purpuream pingit relligiosa lupam."[1]

A copy of these verses had in some surreptitious manner found their way into the hands of the king, who, affecting to be highly indignant at the slur which had been thrown upon the English worship, resolved to make their author suffer for it. Melville was accordingly cited before the English Council at Whitehall, and at once confessed that he was the author of the epigram, but declared that he had intended to show it to no one unless it were to his Majesty himself, and that he had written it in deep grief at seeing such superstitious mummery in a Reformed Church, and under a reformed king, brought

---

[1] Row's History, p. 234. Calderwood, vol. vi. Row thus Englishises the Latin epigram:—

"On kinglie chappell altar stands, blind candlesticks, closed books,
Dry silver basons, two of each, wherefore, says he who looks
The minde and worship of the Lord, doth Ingland so keep closse;
Blind in hir sight, and buried in hir filthiness and drosse?
And while with Roman rites sho doth her kinglie altar dresse,
Religiously a purpur'd whoore to trim sho doth professe."

up under the pure light of the gospel. James himself was not present, but Dr Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who sat near the head of the table, argued that such a libel on the worship of the Established Church was a high misdemeanour, and even amounted to treason. This Melville could not bear from a man whom he hated, and perhaps despised. He interrupted the archbishop. "My lords," said he, "Andrew Melville was never a traitor; but there was one Richard Bancroft who, during the life of the late queen, wrote a treatise against his Majesty's title to the crown; and here is the book," said he, pulling the offending treatise from his bosom. As he spoke thus, he had gradually approached the place where Bancroft sat, and now taking hold of the lawn sleeves of his rochet, he shook them, and called them Romish rags. "If you are the author," he continued, fiercely addressing the primate, "of the book called 'English Scottizing,' I regard you as the capital enemy of all the reformed churches in Europe, [and as such I will profess myself an enemy to you and your proceedings to the effusion of the last drop of my blood." Bishop Barlow attempted to interfere to save the archbishop, but Melville suddenly turning upon him reproached him for his unfair narrative of the Hampton Court Conference, and for representing the king as saying that "though he was in the Church of Scotland, he was not of it." The undaunted presbyter was at last silenced and removed, and when called in again, he was admonished by the Lord Chancellor to add modesty and discretion to his learning and years, and told that he had been found guilty of *scandalum magnatum*, and was to be committed to the custody of the Dean of St Paul's, till the king's pleasure regarding him was known.[1]

In a few sentences we can now trace the career of the Melvilles to its close. Andrew Melville was again called before the Council, and after being anew examined regarding his *scandalum magnatum*, he was committed to the Tower. There he languished for three years, when he was allowed to accept an invitation to become Professor of Divinity at Sedan, where there was a Huguenot University, and there he spent the remainder of his days in broken health and spirits. His nephew James was ordered to take up his residence in Newcastle-on-Tyne, from which he was afterwards allowed to re-

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vi. M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. ii.

move to Berwick, where he died. The other ministers who had accepted the king's invitation to court were allowed to return to their native country, but only under oppressive restrictions.

Close by the side of John Knox, in the list of Scottish worthies, stands Andrew Melville. He has left the deep impress of his mind upon the Scottish Church. He was a man of scholarly accomplishments, great energy, and intrepid courage. Knox made the Church of Scotland Protestant; Melville made it Presbyterian. Naturally dogmatic and overbearing, he was little considerate of the opinions and feelings of others; but it was a striking apology he made for himself when he said, "If my anger go downward, set your foot on it, and put it out; but if it go upward, suffer it to rise to its place."[1] The imperious advocate of High Church principles, he may be fairly regarded as the Hildebrand of Presbytery. He had acquired his opinions in Geneva, where he had lived and taught, and where Calvin, differing from the other Reformers, had maintained the autonomy of the Church, and left behind him this old Roman doctrine as a special legacy to the Scottish Clergy. His temper made him an apt disciple in such a school, for he never could brook a master, and prince and parliament must give way to the presbytery of which he was a member. But all the outlines of his character were flowing and free, and altogether he stands out in bold relief as one of the greatest figures in Scottish ecclesiastical history. James Melville was a man of a different mould—mild, amiable, formed to be led rather than to lead. He was completely under the influence of his uncle, whom he held in such veneration that, notwithstanding his own gentle nature, he followed him even in his most violent courses. His "Diary" presents us with some most graphic pictures of the men of his time, and in his pages there is no more prominent or pleasing portrait than his own. In almost every word, the good, kindly, conscientious man stands revealed.

But we must return to Scotland, and see what is passing there. After a long imprisonment, the fate of the six ministers who had been convicted of treason was made known—they were to be banished the country. At two o'clock on a stormy November morning, they were brought to the pier at Leith in order to embark. A large concourse of people had already

---

[1] M'Crie's Life of Melville, vol. ii.

assembled on the sands to bid them farewell. Welsh, for the last time on Scottish soil, lifted up his voice in prayer, and few men could pray as he did; the whole multitude then joined in singing the 23d Psalm, and when the hopeful words of the last verse had died away, the exiles, for conscience sake, tore themselves from their weeping friends, and were soon steering their course down the Forth on their way to France. The other ministers who had been present at the obnoxious Assembly, but had not been indicted for treason, were banished to the most remote districts of the country, to Lewis, Cantyre, or Caithness, that their zeal might be lost amid these savage solitudes.[1]

The king and bishops now thought that the field was clear for a General Assembly. Eight of the ablest ministers were detained in England, and fourteen others were either in France or the Highlands. In the beginning of December the presbyteries of the Church received a royal missive to appoint certain of their number to meet with certain noblemen at Linlithgow on the 10th of the month, to take steps for suppressing Popery and removing all disagreements from the Church. These missives did not designate this meeting a General Assembly, took no notice of the General Assembly which had been indicted for July, and instead of allowing the presbyteries as usual to elect their own commissioners, specially nominated them; and there was a general bewilderment as to what this meeting might mean.[2]

However, on the appointed day, thirty-three noblemen and about a hundred and thirty ministers met at Linlithgow, and the Earl of Montrose appeared as the king's principal Commissioner. The chief business of the meeting was brought up by his Majesty's letter, in which he recommended that every presbytery should have a perpetual moderator, as a means of promoting order. The ministers were at first staggered at the proposal; but royal influence was strong, the old spirit was becoming weak, and after a committee had deliberated and reported upon the subject, it was almost unanimously agreed to. It was stipulated that these perpetual moderators should enjoy no greater jurisdiction than had been possessed by their predecessors, and should be subject to the censure of the provincial synods; but these restrictions proved weak as tow. It was further provided that these moderators should act as agents

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 590, 591. Row's History, p. 240.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 601-604.

for suppressing Popery—a popular measure; and for this service a hundred pounds Scots was assigned to each of them by his Majesty. The Convention stretched its authority still wider, and took in hand to nominate moderators to the presbyteries, making the bishops moderators of the presbyteries which met at their episcopal seats.[1]

The Assembly had been subservient; but the Church at large did not tamely submit to this insidious encroachment upon its constitution. Loud murmurs were heard from every part of the country. It was not merely said that the meeting at Linlithgow was not a General Assembly of the Church, but that the minute of its proceedings had been sent up to court and altered there. In these circumstances a royal proclamation was issued charging the presbyteries to accept the permanent moderators who had been appointed to them, and the royalist nobles everywhere exerted themselves to force the Church Courts to yield. But many of the Church Courts were in no compliant humour. The Synod of Perth, the Synod of Fife, and the Presbyteries of Lothian and the Merse, distinguished themselves by their efforts to shake off the moderators, who had been fastened on their shoulders like the old man of the sea; and it was not till they found their struggles both desperate and dangerous that they sullenly succumbed to necessity. Several of the ministers who had been nominated moderators refused to accept an office so odious to their brethren and the people,[2] and even those who were most subservient to the king were forced to warn him that a storm was gathering.[3] James was compelled to acknowledge the difficulties he had encountered, and the conscientious zeal of the ministers for the maintenance of parity.[4]

A.D. 1608.

It was not till the last Tuesday of July 1608 that the Assembly was again convened. The Earl of Dunbar acted as the king's Commissioner, and about forty other noblemen were present and took part in the proceedings. When their right was questioned by a minister, the moderator remarked that without them their laws could not be

---

[1] Letter, Earl of Montrose to King, 13th December 1606. Original Letters, &c., 1603-25, Ban. Club Ed. Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 604-27. Row's History, pp. 241, 242.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. Row's History. Scott's Narrative.

[3] Letter dated 28th October 1607, and signed Galloway, Hall, Hewat; to be found in a Collection of Original Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Affairs, between 1603 and 1625, published for the Bannatyne Club.

[4] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. p. 503.

carried into execution. "We," said he, "can preach and pray; they can fight." This Assembly, though tolerant of Prelacy, exhibited all the old intolerance of Popery. The Marquis of Huntly and the Earls of Angus and Errol had relapsed into error; they had not given attendance at the church; they had refused to communicate; though reasoned and remonstrated with, they were obstinate; and so it was resolved that they should again be put under the ban of the Church. Huntly, by a messenger, protested that conscience alone stood in the way of his reconciliation to the Church, and craved farther time, in hope that he might see reason to change; but his apologies were pronounced to be frivolous, and the sentence of excommunication was for the second time solemnly pronounced against him. His Majesty's Commissioner promised, that after forty days the civil sword would strike without mercy. The Presbytery of Glasgow was instructed to proceed against the Earl of Angus, the Presbytery of Perth against the Earl of Errol, and the Presbytery of Irvine against Lord Semphill, who had also been reported to the Assembly as an obstinate Papist.[1]

The Assembly still farther showed its zeal against Popery by resolutions against Jesuits and seminary priests, against pilgrimages to chapels and wells, regarding the searching of merchant vessels for Popish books, the removal of Popish functionaries from office, and compelling the sons of the nobility who travelled abroad to have in their company a pedagogue well grounded in the faith. A lament was made that many churches were still destitute of ministers. In one district there were thirty-one; in Annandale, twenty-eight; in Nithsdale, seventeen; and so over the greater part of the country. A petition was presented for the exiled ministers; and the Commissioner promised to intercede for all save those who had been banished for treason. Finally, the ecclesiastical commissioners were re-appointed, and the Assembly was closed by prayer and the singing of psalms.[2]

It was universally felt that the bishops had gained strength in this Assembly. Their position had not been openly assailed; their power as commissioners and permanent moderators had been continued; and the process of development seemed to be

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 751-74. Row's History, pp. 249-52. Spottiswood, lib. vii.

[2] Ibid.

going on unchecked, which must necessarily end in a full blown Episcopate. For some time they had been entrusted with the sole power of modifying the stipends of the ministers, and here was one great source of their growing influence in the Church. They could raise a friendly minister to comparative plenty; they could leave a hostile one to pine in poverty. Most men, however conscientious, will have a regard to this, especially if they have a wife and family dependent upon them for subsistence. But notwithstanding the increasing power of the bishops, it is certain that there was a deep undercurrent of dissatisfaction in the country; and at this period there were sown the seeds of that bitter feeling toward Episcopacy which has never since been thoroughly eradicated from the Scottish mind.

But notwithstanding the changes which were in progress, the machinery of Presbyterianism was still in full working order. Synods and presbyteries were superintending the local interests of the Church, and kirk-sessions were ruling congregations. Discipline was administered with little relaxation of its ancient severity. It seems, in truth, to have been designed, not so much to bring the erring to repentance, as to put them to shame. Some of the female penitents had ventured to come to church with those plaids which Scottish women have long been accustomed to wear over their heads, in order that, drawing them partly over their face, they might in some measure conceal their confusion. By solemn decrees of kirk-sessions such acts of concealment were forbidden; and frail women were enjoined to leave their plaids at home, and, taking their place on the stool of repentance, to keep their face full toward the congregation.[1]

A.D. 1609. On the 24th of June 1609, the parliament assembled at Edinburgh, and after passing new penal statutes against the unhappy Papists, it proceeded to legislate for the bishops. It conferred upon them the jurisdiction of commissariats, and administration of justice in all spiritual and ecclesiastical causes, as anciently enjoyed by their predecessors in Roman Catholic times. In virtue of this act, they were empowered to decide in all testamentary matters, in all matters affecting marriage and divorce, and generally in every matter which could be brought under the comprehensive words "spiritual and ecclesiastical;" and the Court of Session

---

[1] Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, pp. 63, 116, Spalding Club. The notices referred to belong to the years 1608 and 1651.

was authorised to grant letters of horning to enforce the execution of their sentences.[1]

A few months afterwards, the king gave completeness to this measure by erecting two courts of High Commission—one in each archbishopric. Henry VIII. of England had been the first to institute such a court, for the execution of his tyrannical caprices. Elizabeth had continued it, and made it the minister of her cruelty against the Puritans. James early perceived its capabilities for dealing with the Puritans of the north, and had two twigs from the parent stock transplanted to Scotland, where they took root and flourished vigorously. Each court consisted of the archbishop, his suffragan bishops, and a number of the nobility.[2] The archbishop and four coadjutors, lay or clerical, constituted a quorum; they could call any one before them whom they were pleased to think scandalous in life or erroneous in religion; they could impose any fine; they could imprison for any period; they could depose any minister; they could pronounce sentence of excommunication against any subject of the realm, and see it followed by its proper effects. In all this they were bound by no law but their own discretion. They were subject to no appeal—their sentence was final. Such courts, possessing such unlimited jurisdiction over the goods, and liberties, and consciences of men, rested upon no act of parliament—they were called into existence by a royal proclamation.[3] They were creatures of the prerogative. They associated with the name of bishop everything that was odious in despotism, and slowly accumulated against the house of Stewart the lamentation and woes which befell it in the ages to come.

A royal proclamation was deemed enough to constitute these Courts of High Commission; but an act of parliament was thought necessary to determine the proper colour and cut of a judge's and a clergyman's coat! A statute was framed, proceeding on the ludicrous preamble, that it had been found by daily experience that the greatness of his Majesty's empire, the magnificence of his court, the fame of his wisdom, the civility of his subjects, were alluring princes and strangers from every part of the world, and that it was fitting that bishops and ministers, judges and magistrates, should appear before these

---

[1] James VI., parl. xx. chap. vi.

[2] The two courts were subsequently merged in one.

[3] A copy of the royal commission is given in Calderwood, vol. vii. pp. 57, 58.

in becoming apparel. It was therefore referred to his Majesty's serene wisdom to devise appropriate garments and robes of office for these different functionaries.[1] Valiant colonels have condescended to act as clothiers to their regiments; this famous monarch was constituted by act of parliament tailor to the Court of Session and the Church! Spottiswood informs us that shortly afterwards the *modes* were sent down from London;[2] and Calderwood describes them.[3] The Senators of the College of Justice were to have purple gowns; the advocates, clerks, and scribes, black gowns. The ministers were to wear black clothes, and in the pulpit black gowns; the bishops and doctors of divinity, black stockings to the knee, black gowns, and a black crape about their neck. On the 15th of February 1610, the Lords of Session and bishops put on their new robes of office, and walked in procession from the Chancellor's house to the Tolbooth, the beheld of all beholders.[4]

A.D. 1610.

There is now little to record but the successive steps by which Episcopacy was forced upon the nation. On the 1st of April 1610, the king directed missives from Whitehall, appointing a General Assembly to be held at Glasgow on the 8th of June. In these missives he says enough to convince us that the Scotch ministers were still as bullocks unaccustomed to the yoke; he was no way "assured of their peaceful inclinations." He therefore informed the presbyteries that the Archbishop of St Andrews would signify to them the members he wished sent to his Assembly;[5] which the archbishop accordingly did, expressing a hope to some of the presbyteries that they would not be refractory.[6] On the appointed day, thirteen bishops, thirteen noblemen, forty barons, and upwards of a hundred ministers met; and the Earl of Dunbar appeared as the Royal Commissioner. The first day was kept as a fast, which, says the historian of Presbytery, was like the fast that was called when Naboth's vineyard was taken from him.[7] One of the characteristics of this Assembly, and of all the Assemblies of the period, was, that

---

[1] James VI., parl. xx. chap. viii.

[2] History, lib. vii.

[3] History, vol. vii. p. 54.

[4] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. p. 55.

[5] The royal missive is copied in Calderwood's History, vol. vii. pp. 92, 93.

[6] Archbishop of St Andrews to the Presbytery of Chirnside. (Calderwood, vol. vii. pp. 91, 92.)

[7] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. p. 94.

no controverted question was openly discussed, but settled at a private conference, and the result presented to the Assembly to be registered. In this way the following propositions were agreed upon:—

1. That the calling of General Assemblies belonged to his Majesty; and, consequently, that the meeting at Aberdeen in 1605 was null and void; but that an Assembly should be held every year.

2. That synods should be held in every diocese twice in the year, in which the archbishop or bishop of the diocese should preside.

3. That no sentence of excommunication or absolution should be pronounced without the approbation of the bishop of the diocese.

4. That all presentations in time coming should be directed to the archbishop or bishop of the diocese where the vacant benefice lay; and that he, if he found the presentee qualified, should take the assistance of the ministers of the district, and perfect the act of ordination.

5. That in the deposition of ministers, the bishop should associate with himself the ministers of the bounds within which the delinquent officiated, and, after trial of the fact, pronounce sentence.

6. That every minister at his admission should swear obedience to his Majesty and his Ordinary.

7. That the bishops should visit their dioceses themselves, unless the bounds were too great; in which case they might appoint a substitute.

8. That exercise of doctrine should be continued weekly among the ministers at the time of their accustomed meetings, and that the bishop or his deputy should be moderator.

9. That the bishops should be subject in all things to the censure of the General Assembly, and being found culpable, might, with his Majesty's consent, be deprived.

10. That no one should be elected as a bishop under forty years of age, and who had not actually taught as a minister for ten years.

Lastly, That no minister, in the pulpit or the public exercise, should argue against or disobey the acts of this Assembly, under the pain of deprivation; and, particularly, that no one should discuss in the pulpit the parity or imparity of ministers.[1]

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vii. pp. 99-103, Spottiswood curtails the resolutions. Calderwood gives them in full.

It is certain that considerable sums of money were distributed among the members of this Assembly, which had thus remorselessly overturned the Presbyterian polity of the Church. Calderwood affirms that it was given in payment of votes, though under the name of defraying travelling expenses;[1] Spottiswood declares that it was given only as the payment of the stipulated salaries of the permanent moderators.[2] However this may be, the last resolution abundantly shows that the Assembly had ventured to fly in the face of the Church and of the nation. But notwithstanding the terrors of deposition, many ministers ventured to speak out; and this led the Privy Council to issue a proclamation forbidding any one to impugn, deprave, contradict, condemn, or utter his disallowance or dislike of any point or article of the most grave and wise conclusions of that Assembly. But neither king nor Council could altogether repress the free utterance of indignant thought. When the main battle had given way, when the General Assembly allowed itself to be led captive, the Church still carried on a guerilla warfare against despotism and Episcopacy in its inferior courts.

The Marquis of Huntly and the Earls of Angus and Errol were lying in different prisons on account of their apostasy to Rome. They presented a petition to this Assembly, offering to subscribe the Confession of Faith, and do anything that was required of them. After a conference with three bishops, and a probation of six months, the Marquis was set at liberty, and allowed to return to Strathbogie. The Earl of Angus, upon reconsidering the matter, resolved to abandon his country rather than his creed, and found in France that liberty of religious worship which was denied him in Scotland. At a meeting of the Council in the Castle of Edinburgh, the Earl of Errol had professed his conformity with the dominant faith, and everything was ready for his reconciliation to the Church; but on that very night he was so smitten with remorse that he was tempted to commit suicide, and sending for the Archbishop of Glasgow in the morning, he stated his unwillingness to subscribe to doctrines which he did not believe.[3] We may surely regret that such a tender conscience was made subject to such violence.

Scotland had now bishops in outward form at least; but according to the Church notions which were in vogue, they

---

[1] History, vol. vii. p. 97.

[2] History, lib. vii. p. 513.

[3] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. p. 513.

were no better than images of clay, and required the Promethean fire to give them episcopal life. Soon after the dissolution of the Assembly, Spottiswood, Archbishop of Glasgow, Lamb, Bishop of Brechin, and Hamilton, Bishop of Galloway, set out for London. On their reception at court, the king explained to them that he had at his great charge recovered the bishoprics from the hands of those who had possessed them, and bestowed them upon men who, he hoped, would prove worthy of their places; but, as he could not make them bishops, as there were none in Scotland who could, and as they could not take that honour to themselves, he had sent for them to England, that they might be solemnly consecrated, and upon their return home bestow the spiritual gift upon others. Spottiswood ventured to suggest that this might give rise to the old jealousy of the Church of England's supremacy in Scotland; but James stated that he had provided against that, by arranging that consecration should be given to them neither by York nor Canterbury, but by the Bishops of London, Ely, and Bath. The Scots bishops thanked his Majesty for his care of their Church, and declared their willingness to submit; and, accordingly, the consecration was appointed to take place in the Chapel of London House on the 21st of October.[1]

In the meantime, the Bishop of Ely expressed his opinion that the Scotsmen must be made priests before they were consecrated bishops, as they were destitute of Episcopal ordination. This opinion, if carried out, would have required the re-ordination of every minister in Scotland, and, on the same principle, their being baptised anew; and it was scarcely deemed safe to ask them to bow their heads so low. Bancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, therefore argued that there was no necessity for re-ordination; that seeing where no bishops could be had, ordination by presbyters must be deemed lawful, as otherwise it might be doubted if there were any lawful vocation in most of the Reformed Churches. Abbot, the Bishop of London, got rid of the difficulty in another way. He held that there was no necessity for passing the inferior orders of deacon and priest, but that the episcopal character might be conveyed at once, as appeared from the example of St Ambrose, Nectarius, Eucherius, and others, who from mere laymen were advanced at once into the episcopal chair. Ely yielded to the majority; and, accordingly, on the appointed

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. p. 514.

day, Spottiswood, Lamb, and Hamilton were consecrated, and afterwards conveyed to Scotland the mystic virtues of the apostolical succession, which they transferred to their brethren by the laying on of their episcopal hands.[1] The missing link was found.

A.D. 1612. Bishops had been recognised by the General Assembly, and they had now been made partakers of the episcopal character; but still they had no legal standing in the country, as the act of 1592—the Magna Charta of Presbytery—stood unrepealed on the statute-book. This defect was now to be supplied. The parliament assembled in Edinburgh on the 16th of October 1612, and ratified all the acts which had been passed at the Assembly of 1610, with some alterations which tended to elevate the bishops still higher above their brethren in the ministry.[2] The Assembly and the parliament, in fact, at this period, were like the two parts of a well-balanced machine, and worked beautifully the one into the other.

The contest was now over, and Episcopacy was victorious. The vehement debates in the Assembly, the bold defiances to the king, the free utterance of thought in the pulpit, was hushed, and there was a dead lull after the storm, broken only by the grumbling of some discontended synod or presbytery. But the fear of Popery had not yet died away. The adherents of Rome were still numerous and active; propagandists traversed the country in disguise; and many of the nominal Protestants were still unable entirely to divorce themselves from Roman feelings, opinions, and practices. The citizens of Glasgow were still under the impression that a crucifix painted in their house gave luck; limners were found to ply the unlawful trade, and the presbytery busied itself in hunting them out.[3] The truth is, the popular mind was by no means purged of Popery. The people in many districts still clung to old religious customs, which had become intertwined with their social and domestic habits. On Midsummer Eve they persisted in kindling bonfires, and the fines of the magistrates did not deter them.[4] At Yule, and on New

---

[1] Spottiswood, lib. vii. Neal's History, vol. i. Calderwood, &c.

[2] James VI., parl. xxi. chap. i.

[3] Records of the Presbytery of Glasgow, 8th July 1612, and 20th April 1614. Appendix to Papers Illustrative of Queen Mary and King James, Bannatyne Club Ed.

[4] Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, p. 61, anno 1608, published by the Spalding Club.

Year's Day, frolicsome women clothed themselves in male attire, and as guisers visited the houses of their neighbours and friends.[1] Persons professing Protestantism still undertook pilgrimages, and thought they derived benefit from washing themselves in sacred wells. The Sunday was still in many places desecrated by markets, by fishing, by the operations of husbandry. But stricter notions were gradually growing up. Fines were levied upon persons who absented themselves from church. Eavesdroppers were employed to go about the streets, and pick up all whom they chanced to overhear swearing; and such defaulters, being brought before the magistrates, were punished by palmies.[2]

A.D. 1614.

Toward the end of the year 1614, a Jesuit named Ogilvy was apprehended at Glasgow. There were found in his custody three little books, with directions for receiving confessions, a warrant to grant dispensations to those who possessed Church-livings, a few reliques, and a tuft of St Ignatius's hair, which he held in the utmost veneration. When put upon his trial, he declared that he had come into Scotland to save souls, but refused to give any information which might criminate others. The judicial procedure of most countries at that period was disgraced by barbarous customs; and this poor man was kept from sleeping for several successive nights together, that this slow and exquisite torture might lead him to speak out; and in the half-delirious state which was thus induced, he began to let his secrets escape; but his nerves were no sooner restored by rest, than he denied everything he had said. All this was reported to the king, and torture was suggested; but James humanely forbade it, and directed that if it should be found that Ogilvy was merely a Jesuit, and had said mass, he should be banished; but that if he held the supremacy of the Pope over kings, the law should be allowed to take its course. James was more jealous for himself than his God. Ogilvy returned guarded answers to the sifting questions which were sent down from London to be put to him; but as he declared his belief that the Pope had jurisdiction over his Majesty, and over all Christian kings, in spiritual affairs, for that he was hanged in the High Street of Glasgow.[3] Thus the metro-

---

[1] Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, p. 50, anno 1606. In some districts, "guisers" still go about visiting houses on the last night of the year.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vii. pp. 193-96.

polis of the west has martyrs for spiritual supremacy which she wots not of. Protestant zeal went still further, and reached the unhappy Jesuit's friends. A citizen was brought before the presbytery for having harboured him, and was glad to make his peace by appearing for three successive Sundays at the door of the High Church, clothed in linen, with bare head, giving tokens of repentance, and craving the prayers of the people.[1]

A.D. 1616. Two years subsequent to this the Marquis of Huntly was again convicted of having apostatized, and, what is more, of having prevented his tenants from going to church. On a warrant from the Court of High Commission, he was committed to the Castle of Edinburgh, but in a few days was liberated by a warrant from the chancellor. The bishops loudly complained of this infringement upon their jurisdiction; but Huntly was already on his way to London, and found means to get access to the king, by whom it was arranged, with the consent of the Bishop of Caithness, who happened to be at Court, that he should be absolved by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Primate of All England intimated what had been done to the Primate of Scotland, but it was felt to be an encroachment upon the Scottish Church; and it was therefore agreed that the Marquis should present a supplication to the General Assembly and be absolved anew, which was accordingly done.[2]

At Aberdeen, on the 13th of August, the Assembly met. The primate, without any election, took possession of the moderator's chair. "A number of lords and barons," says Calderwood, "decored the Assembly with silks and satins, but without any commission to vote.[3] As usual, a number of acts were passed against the Papists. To have an *Agnus Dei*, a rosary, a cross, or a crucifix, about the person, in the house, or inscribed on any book, was declared to be tantamount to apostasy. To make a pilgrimage to a chapel or well exposed the pilgrim to the terrors of the High Commission. No man might act as an apothecary, or practise physic, without being first examined as to his orthodoxy, as it had been found that Jesuits were carrying on their proselytizing practices under the cloak of these professions. This Assembly,

---

[1] Records of the Presbytery of Glasgow, March 1615. Papers Illustrative of Queen Mary and King James, Bannatyne Club Ed.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vii.

[3] History, vol. vii. p. 223.

moreover, projected a new Confession of Faith, a new Catechism, a new Liturgy, a Book of Canons, and ordained every minister to keep a record of the baptisms, marriages, and deaths in his parish; and all this it did at the special bidding of the king, who seems, however, in the matter of registration, to have been far before his age.[1]

When James went to England to take possession of his new crown, he promised to visit his native country every three years. Thirteen years had elapsed, and still he had not come; but now he sent a letter to the Council to assure them of his coming, which he declared "proceeded of a longing to see the place of his breeding—a salmon-like instinct."[2] About the same time a proclamation was issued by the Privy Council commanding that cattle should everywhere be fed, that there might be enough of beef in the country when the king came.[3] But preparations of another and more ominous kind were begun in the Chapel at Holyrood House. A company of English carpenters were sent to refit it after the pattern which they had seen in the south. Organs were disembarked at Leith; gilded statues of the evangelists and apostles came next to be set up in the stalls; and the populace began to say, that in a church with organs and images a mass might be expected. The bishops thought it right to advertise his Majesty of the state of public feeling,[4] but his Majesty was wroth, and told them that they could not distinguish between pictures intended for ornament and images erected for worship. You can endure, said the king, lions, dragons, and devils to be figured in your churches, but you will not allow the patriarchs and apostles. Notwithstanding this scold, the king said the statues would not be set up, as there was not now time for it.[5]

On Friday, the 16th of May 1617, James re-entered his ancient capital, and was received as Scotland has ever received

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. pp. 229-31. Original Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Affairs, 1609-25. "Instructions to our Right Trusty and Well-Beloved Cousin and Councillor, the Earl of Montrose." (Published by the Ban. Club).

[2] Spottiswood, lib. vii. p. 529.

[3] Calderwood's History, vol. vii.

[4] The Bishop of Galloway was Dean of the Chapel Royal, and penned this letter, getting the signatures of St Andrews, Aberdeen, Brechin, &c.

[5] Letter, the King to the Ministers of Edinburgh, 23d March 1617. (Published, among Original Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Affairs, by the Bannatyne Club.) Spottiswood relates the circumstance in his History, and this letter proves his accuracy. The letter is very characteristic of James.

her kings, even when they hardly deserved her welcome. He repaid their loyalty by insulting their religion. On the very day after his arrival, the Anglican Service was begun in the Chapel Royal. There were bishops in surplices, choristers singing, an organ pealing forth its notes. Upon the 8th of June the Privy Councillors, bishops, and nobles who were in Edinburgh, were commanded to repair to Holyrood, where the communion was to be celebrated after the English form. Many went, and, to humour the king, violated the order of their church, and received the sacrament kneeling. A few hung back, and these were specially noted by the proselytizing monarch, and ordered to prepare themselves for the solemnity against the ensuing Sunday.[1]

On the 28th of June the parliament assembled. His Majesty, as of yore, made a speech in praise of his own good intentions; the chancellor also made a speech, and then the Lords of the Articles were chosen, not without some altercation, and not entirely to the king's satisfaction.[2] The legislation to which the Estates first addressed themselves affected the Church. They passed an act regarding the election of bishops; another regarding the restitution of cathedral chapters; and a third, and most salutary one, regarding the plantation of churches, and the provision of stipends for their ministers.[3] But it began to be mooted abroad that the king had submitted to the Lords of the Articles a proposition, which, if passed into a law, would be tantamount to the abolition of General Assemblies. The proposition was,—"That whatsoever his Majesty should determine touching the external government of the Church, with the advice of the archbishops,

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. viii. pp. 246, 247. The same forms were observed in the Chapel Royal after the king's return to the south. In 1618 the Bishop of Galloway wrote to James:—"As your Highness commands, so have I done. On the passion and resurrection days, I ministered the communion, kneeling, to my Lord Chancellor, Secretary, Register, Advocate, and Treasurer-Depute, and the Laird of Ruthven. My Lord of Mar had communicated on the day before. I required others when the lords had risen, and attended them at leisure, but no more presented themselves to the table. Many told me after that they were minded to communicate, but they stood every one on the coming of others." The bishop goes on to suggest that at Pentecost the lords should be made to bring their servants with them, and also that all who lived in the palace should be brought to swell the number of communicants. Such shifts, how pitiful! (Original Letters, 1603-25, Ban. Ed).

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. p. 250.

[3] James VI., parl. xxii. chapters i. ii. iii.

bishops, and a competent number of the clergy, should have the strength of a law." The king did not conceal that this was designed to supersede General Assemblies. "To have matters ruled as they have been," said he, "in your General Assemblies, I will never agree; for the bishops must rule the ministers, and the king both, in things indifferent, and not repugnant to the Word of God." The Lords gave their consent to the proposition.[1]

A large number of ministers were at this time in Edinburgh, drawn together from every part of the country. They met, and drew up a most respectful, but earnest, protest against the proposed measure, as subversive of a polity which they believed to be founded on the Word of God. Even the Bishop of Galloway appended his signature to it; and Hewat, one of the ministers of Edinburgh and Abbot of Crossraguel, undertook to present it. Proceeding to the palace, he there met with Spottiswood, now Archbishop of St Andrews; and in an altercation which took place between them, the copy which he had was torn. The king, learning what was passing, came out of his bedroom undressed; and Hewat, going down upon his knees, declared that, if the document were offensive to his Majesty, he would not present it in parliament.[2] The king was angry at the insolence of any set of men protesting against his sovereign wishes; but he was also frightened, though he did not confess his fear; and when the proposition came to be read over in the parliament to be passed into a law, he ordered the clerk to pass it over, remarking by way of consoling himself, that he could do as much in virtue of his own prerogative, without asking the advice of any one.[3] He did not, however, forget the protesters. Hewat, and Simson, the minister of Dalkeith, whom he considered as ringleaders, were deprived of their offices, and cast into prison; and David Calderwood, the celebrated historian of the Church of Scotland, who had joined in the protest, and deferentially defended it in presence of the king and the High Commission, was stripped of his ministry, and banished the country.[4]

During his Majesty's progress to the south, he affected to discover that Puritan precision in the observance of the Sabbath was one of the causes why Papists refused to be con-

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. p. 531.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii. pp. 531-33. Calderwood, vol. vii.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Calderwood's History, vol. vii.

verted. He therefore published his famous "Declaration to encourage Recreations and Sports on the Lord's Day." In this singular document it is declared to be his Majesty's pleasure that, after divine service, his good people should not be hindered from any such lawful recreations as dancing, archery, leaping, or vaulting, nor from having May-games, Whitsun-ales, morris-dances, and setting up May-poles; and that women should have liberty to carry rushes to the church to decorate it, according to their old custom. His Majesty, however, prohibited such unlawful sports on Sunday as bear-baiting, bull-baiting, interludes, and bowling; and declared that none should have the benefit of the act save those who had attended divine service in their parish church in the forenoon. This royal declaration was read in all the parish churches of Lancashire, which abounded with Papists; and it is said that it was to have been read in all the churches of the kingdom, had not Archbishop Abbot wisely opposed it. The news of it soon reached Scotland, and excited considerable apprehension lest the monarch, in his royal beneficence, might be inclined to extend such considerate indulgences to his northern subjects.[1]

The Church of Scotland was now nearly conformed to the Church of England in government, but not in worship; and the king had set his heart upon conformity in all things. The General Assembly of 1616 had resolved that the acts of former Assemblies should be collected, to assist the Church judicatories in the administration of discipline, only these were no longer to be called Acts of Assembly, but Canons of the Church.[2] His Majesty had proposed that to these canons there should be added certain others of his own framing, touching the confirmation of children, the administration of baptism and the Lord's Supper in private, the reception of the communion kneeling, and the observance of holidays; but the

---

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. Calderwood, &c.

[2] On the part of the king and his bishops, at this period, there was a pedantic aping of Roman and Anglican terms. The General Assembly was now a National Council; its acts were canons; Presbyterians were Puritans; parents in baptism were godfathers and godmothers, &c. (See Original Letters, &c., 1603-25, Ban. Ed.) On the part of some Aberdonians, there would appear to have been a desire to overdo Episcopacy. An order of the kirk-session was passed against children being brought to baptism with more than two godfathers, proceeding upon the narrative that even some *puir men* had brought ten or twelve. (Ecclesiastical Records of Aberdeen, p. 109, Spalding Club Ed.)

bishops had urged upon him that it would be dangerous to introduce such innovations upon their own authority, as they had never been even mooted in the ecclesiastical courts.

During his visit to Scotland, James reverted to the subject in a meeting of the bishops and leading ministers at St Andrews. In a speech which he made to them, he extolled his care for the Church: he alluded to the wrongs which he had received at their hands: he expatiated upon his prerogative. "It is a power innated and a special prerogative," said the philosophic monarch, "which we that are Christian kings have, to order and dispose of external things in the policy of the Church, as we, by advice of our bishops, shall find most fitting; and for your approving or disapproving, deceive not yourselves, I will never regard it, unless you bring me a reason that I cannot answer." The bishops and clergy were overawed by these flashes of the prerogative, and, going down upon their knees, begged that they might be allowed a conference among themselves. When they returned they craved permission to hold a General Assembly, pledging themselves that everything the king desired would then be done. An Assembly was accordingly appointed to be held at St Andrews, upon the 25th of November.[1] How different this interview and those between the king and his clergy previous to his accession to the English throne! But all things were changed. The king was then weak; and now he was strong; the nobles were then independent, for they had little to lose and nothing to gain, but now they were crouching, for they were begging favours at the English court; the ministers were then bold, for they were not looking to bishoprics, and they knew that their voice was the voice of the people—now there was nothing for it but to go down upon their knees.

The 25th of November came, and the Assembly met; but notwithstanding the pledged honour of the bishops, it proved unmanageable. Some ministers pressed for delay that they might explain the proposed changes to the people; others, when they heard what was moving, quietly slipped away home, and nothing definite was done.[2] When his Majesty learned the result he was highly indignant; he wrote to the archbishops telling them he was now come to an age when he would not be content to be fed with broth, as one of their cloth was wont to say to him; he commanded them to keep

---

[1] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii.

[2] Ibid.

Christmas, which was now approaching; and added in a postscript, that as the Scottish Church had so far contemned his clemency, they would know what it was to draw the anger of a king upon them.[1] This letter to the archbishops was accompanied by another to the Council, prohibiting the payment of stipends to any of the rebellious ministers till they had shown their willingness to conform—a mean, most unjustifiable, and most arbitrary expedient to extort compliance from poverty.

Notwithstanding this failure, it was resolved that another trial should be made, and accordingly an Assembly was indicted to meet at Perth on the 25th of August 1618. The Archbishop of St Andrews made sure of his purpose this time by canvassing the members previous to the meeting, and making the modification of their stipends tell upon their votes, so that beforehand he knew what would be the suffrage of almost every man. Lord Binning, Lord Scone, and Lord Carnegie appeared as his Majesty's Commissioners. A considerable number of the nobility presented themselves furnished with missives by his Majesty, authorising them to vote. The archbishop assumed the chair as his right. In the Little Church, where the Assembly met, there were set a long table, and at the head of it a short cross one. At this cross table his Majesty's Commissioners and the Moderator took their seats upon chairs provided for them. At the sides of the long table were set forms for the noblemen, barons, burgesses, bishops, and doctors. The ministers were left to stand behind and look on, while the business was settled by the dignified conclave around the table.[2]

The king's letter was twice read over, and we are at a loss whether to marvel most at its insolence or its absurdity. It declares it was his Majesty's intention never to have called an Assembly more, and that it was only out of his great condescension he had deigned to call this one; he alluded to the desire of some to have all ecclesiastical matters arranged at ecclesiastical meetings, but he declared that he had the power, if he had the will, to determine all such subjects himself, without consulting them at all; he acknowledged that he did not like to remember the treatment he had received from the

---

[1] Letter, the King to Archbishop Spottiswood, 6th December, 1617, published among Original Letters relating to Ecclesiastical Affairs, 1603-25, Ban. Club. Spottiswood refers to this letter in his History.

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vii.

Scottish ministers in his youth, but piously remarked that the love of God and His truth had always upheld him, and that so they would to the end of his life; he reprimanded them for their obstinacy, and upbraided them for their ingratitude in not acknowledging the blessing of having such a loving and such a religious king to reign over them.[1] The Archbishop followed up this letter with a speech, in which he protested that the Five Articles to be proposed to them were none of his; that they were wholly of the king's devising; but still he strongly urged the Assembly to give them its concurrence. Dr Young, the Dean of Winchester, who had brought down the royal letter, next made a speech, in which he spoke of his Majesty's wrath as already kindled, and as ready to burst forth and consume everything, unless it were quenched by the submission of this Assembly.[2]

The Presbyterian party had mustered so strong that the Royal Commissioners were at first extremely doubtful of the result. The town was crowded with men from Fife of the Melville stamp.[3] An effort was made to have every subject discussed in open Assembly; but the contrary was carried, and the Five Articles were referred to a committee of the House, where every one of them was keenly debated; but in the end, every one of them was recommended. Upon Wednesday, the 27th of August, the report of the committee was brought up for approval, and the debate was renewed, but conscience was brow-beat by authority, and country ministers were snubbed by insolent courtiers. Scot of Cupar and Carmichael led the opposition; but the representative of royalty put Carmichael down, and "in the end My Lord of St Andrews," so wrote Binning to the king, "cutting short their affected shifts, whereby they intended either to disappoint the matter or refer it to another meeting, ordained this proposition only to be voted, Whether the Assembly would obey your Majesty in admitting the Articles or refuse them?" Some members ventured to suggest that the Articles should be voted separately; but the archbishop told them that the king must have them all, or none. At length the vote was taken, after every one had been informed that his conduct would be

[1] A copy of the royal epistle will be found in Calderwood, vol. vii.

[2] Spottiswood, lib. vii. Calderwood, vol. vii.

[3] Lord Binning wrote to the king, that on coming to town he found that so many presbyteries, especially those of Fife and the Lothians, had sent such precise and wilful Puritans, that he was extremely doubtful of the issue. (Letter, 27th August 1618.)

specially reported to the king. Eighty-six, says Lord Binning, allowed the Articles; forty-nine refused; three did not vote. His Majesty's Commissioners — says David Calderwood, analysing the vote—all the noblemen except Ochiltree; all the barons except Waughton, who went home; all the doctors except Dr Strang; all the burgesses and a number of the ministers, voted in the affirmative. One nobleman, one doctor, and forty-five ministers voted in the negative. "Albeit the contention was vehement," wrote Lord Binning to his royal master, "both in the conference and public Assembly; yet after the Articles were voted, there appeared great contentment in many good men's faces."[1] Without believing this, we may believe that there would at least be a feeling of relief, after the state of violent tension in which men's minds had for some time been kept.

The following Five Articles now formed part of the ecclesiastical law of the land:—1. That the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ should be received kneeling. 2. That it might be administered in private to the sick. 3. That baptism might be administered at home when the infant could not conveniently be brought to the Church. 4. That all children of eight years of age should be brought to the bishop on his visitation, to be questioned as to their knowledge, and to receive his blessing. 5. That the days commemorative of Christ's birth, passion, resurrection, and ascension, and of the Holy Ghost's descent, should be devoutly observed.

The king had carried his point. He had set himself up as a dictator in the Church, and the Church had yielded to his dictation. But the old Presbyterian spirit was not entirely extinct. The ministers were ordered to read the Five Articles of Perth from their pulpits, but many of them refused. An Act of the Privy Council was passed confirming the procedure of the Assembly, and enjoining compliance upon both ministers and people; and proclamation of this was made at the

---

[1] Letter, Lord Binning to King James, St Johnstones, 27th August (at night) 1618—(the very night of the day on which the Five Articles were carried). Original Letters, &c., Ban. Ed. There is also still extant a letter from Spottiswood to John Murray of Lochmaben, dated 2d September 1618, in which he says, "Many of the noblemen and gentlemen his Majesty sent letters to, for assisting the service, came not, excusing themselves by sickness and ill disposition; but I think their minds were more sick than their bodies, and are so still." The archbishop goes on to say that absentees should be noted, and such as came specially thanked by the king, and that to this end he had given a memorandum to the Dean of Winchester.

market-cross of Edinburgh; but already it began to be seen, that in cases like this, it is easier to make laws than to execute them.[1] When Christmas came round, many of the shopkeepers of Edinburgh kept their booths open, and were seen pacing in front of them, instead of repairing to church; for this they were summoned before the Court of High Commission.[2] When Easter approached it was the same. Some of the ministers resolved to comply with the court, and dispense the sacrament to kneeling communicants; others determined to resist. Crowds of people abandoned the churches where the new forms were introduced, and resorted to those where the old Presbyterian ritual was preserved. Hundreds and thousands flocked out of the gates of Edinburgh, where the four ministers had succumbed on their way to the rural parishes, where they would receive the sacrament in the old way which they loved.[3] The provost of Edinburgh, a gentleman who had received the honour of knighthood on his Majesty's visit to his northern metropolis, absented himself from the church, to avoid taking the sacrament in a fashion which was odious to him. A Senator of the College of Justice was cited before the Commission for the same misdemeanour. Many of the elders and deacons refused to officiate. Of those of the laity who did come to church, some went down upon their knees as they received the consecrated elements; others refused, and not a few were seen to be in tears.[4] Confusion and sadness of

---

[1] On the 28th of November, Lord Binning wrote to the king, that he had learned some of the ministers intended to disobey the Five Articles. On the 30th, the Archbishop of Glasgow addressed a letter to the Presbytery of Ayr, ordering them to preach on Christmas Day on some such subject as the nativity or incarnation, and hoping that none of them would be troublesome. Binning afterwards informed his Majesty, that the Ministers of Edinburgh had requested the Archbishop of St Andrews to come and occupy their pulpit on Christmas Day, but that he was not very willing to come. (Original Letters, &c., 1603-25, Ban. Club Ed.)

[2] Calderwood's History, vol. vii.

[3] Ibid. vol. vii. p. 359. The king, in a letter to his Scotch Privy Council, refers to the numbers who had fled from the town to the country churches. He alludes also to some pamphlets which had been published, and asks his Council to see these things punished. (Original Letters, &c., 1603-25, Ban. Ed.)

[4] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. On the 16th March 1619, Lord Binning wrote to the king, giving his Majesty an account of the observance of Easter in Edinburgh. He states that letters had been written to all the Privy Councillors, Lords of Session, and magistrates, desiring them to come and walk in procession from the chancellor's lodging to the church. Some excused themselves by sickness, &c., but many came. The nobles, councillors, and sessioners came first to the Table, and, all upon their knees,

spirit had been infused into the cup of communion which the Scottish Christians were required to drink. They ate their passover with bitter herbs.

Nor did this occur only in one place, or on one occasion. The antipathy to the Anglican rites was almost universal among the people, and time did not diminish it. The terrors of the High Commission were employed to enforce submission, since argument had failed to carry persuasion; and during the whole subsequent reign of James, we are continually hearing of some recusant minister being dragged to its bar, deposed from his office, and cast into prison. The persecution began with Dickson, the minister of the west parish of Edinburgh; and many of his brethren afterwards exhibited the same steadfastness, and bore the same punishments. The public feeling found utterance in pamphlets and poems, which the government tried in vain to suppress. They were surreptitiously printed and dispersed among the people, who greedily read them.

In July 1621, a parliament was called together, chiefly for the purpose of ratifying the Five Articles, which still wanted the sanction of law. A number of ministers assembled in Edinburgh to draw up a petition to be laid before it, but they were charged to leave the town; and every precaution was taken to prevent them from lodging a protest which they had prepared. The Articles were carried, but not without a struggle. Seventy-seven voted for them, fifty against them. A majority of the burghs were found in the opposition; the Sheriffdoms were divided, and it was only by the votes of the bishops and higher nobility that the obnoxious acts were carried.[1]

The year 1618 witnessed not only the Assembly at Perth, which sanctioned the Five Articles, but the celebrated Synod of Dort, which condemned Arminianism, and declared Calvinism to be the doctrine of the Dutch Churches. In this ecclesiastical council there were present, not only Dutch and Walloon divines, but the representatives of almost every Re-

---

received the elements from the ministers—Ramsay and Galloway—who gave them to each with their own hands. Their example, says Binning, was generally followed by the congregation, so that neither man nor woman, during the space of four hours, offered to receive the sacrament sitting, except one base fellow. It is plain Lord Binning puts the best face on the matter; he, however, mentions that many had gone to the country, especially women. (Original Letters, Ban. Club Ed.)

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vii.

formed Church in Europe. Walter Balcanquhal was present as the representative of the Scotch Church; and of him it is recorded, that his apparel was decent, and that in all respects he gave much satisfaction.[1] The tenets of Arminius were reprobated in five different propositions, and, from this circumstance, it was reported among the common people of Scotland that the Hollanders had condemned the Five Articles of Perth.[2] The report was ridiculous as it was false; but even such a report is frequently an index of the state of feeling. King James was at first pleased with the decisions of the synod, but soon afterwards we find him bestowing his favours upon Arminian divines. The Scottish bishops were inoculated with the same opinions, which still further widened the gulph between them and the ministers who had, from the first planting of the Protestant Church, been strongly attached to the teaching of Augustine and Calvin.

In the few remaining years which fill up the reign of King James, there is little to record. The king and the Court of Commission persisted in enforcing obedience to the tyrannical decrees; and the ministers and people sullenly submitted, or continued to resist.

There is a story belonging to the year 1622, which deserves to be recorded, as interesting in itself, and as very descriptive of some of the chief actors in the period over which we have passed. Welsh had now been in banishment for upwards of sixteen years, during which time he had resided in France. His health began to fail, and in 1622 he ventured to come to London. His wife, the daughter of John Knox, managed to get access to court, to petition that her husband might be allowed to return to Scotland, and seek convalescence from his native air. His Majesty, upon her introduction, asked who was her father. "Mr Knox," she replied. "Knox and Welsh!" exclaimed the king; "the devil never made such a match as that." "It is very likely, sir," said she, "for we never speired (asked) his advice." The king next asked her how many children of her father's were living, and if they were lads or lasses. She said three, and that they were all lasses. "God be thanked," cried the king, lifting up both his hands, "for if they had been three lads, I had never bruiked my three kingdoms in peace." Mrs Welsh now took the opportunity of urging her petition that his Majesty would give her

---

[1] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. pp. 479, 480.

[2] Spottiswood's History, lib. vii.

husband his native air. "Give him the devil!" said the king coarsely. "Give that to your hungry courtiers," said the pious lady, rebuking his profanity. After some further conversation, the king told her that if she would persuade her husband to submit to the bishops, he would allow him to return to Scotland. The heroic matron, the daughter of Knox, lifted up her apron, and holding it out toward the king, replied, "Please your Majesty, I'd rather kep (receive, keep from falling) his head there."[1] Her petition was refused, and Welsh soon afterwards died an exile in London.

Three years afterwards, James also died. In Scotland he was not greatly lamented, save by the bishops who had sprung up in the sunshine of his favour, and the few hungry nobles who haunted his court, grew rich upon English spoil, and brought upon their native country the reproach of beggary. He abandoned presbytery to overturn its government and persecute its ministers; he embraced prelacy to purge it from puritanism; and lost the esteem of one nation without gaining the respect of another. His foolish ideas of the divine right of kings, and of the extent of his prerogative, laid the foundation of those disasters which brought his son to the scaffold, and drove his race from the throne. English adulation, opulence, and power developed his vices, and choked up his virtues. His youth was more virtuous than his old age; and profligacy in the old is peculiarly repulsive. He grew fond of eating, drinking, and indolence; and licentious favourites ruled all. He was clever and learned for a king; he was certainly witty; but he had little vigour or comprehensiveness of mind, and no true dignity of character. A foreign ambassador pronounced him "the wisest fool in Christendom." Henry of Navarre is said to have remarked—"He was undoubtedly the Solomon of his age, as he was the son of David who played upon the harp." It was on the 27th of May 1625 that he died, being then in his 59th year of his age.

CHAPTER XVI.

CHARLES I. ascended the throne of Great Britain and Ireland amid the general acclamations of a people ever inclined to think hopefully of their hereditary kings. He was born at

---

[1] M'Crie's Life of Knox.

Dunfermline in the year 1600, was baptised by a Presbyterian minister, and entrusted to the care of Presbyterian tutors; but he was still a child when his father succeeded to the English crown, and placed him under men who taught him to abominate Presbytery as akin to democracy, and to cherish Episcopacy as the firmest ally of arbitrary power. Immediately upon his accession, he married Henrietta Maria, daughter of Henry IV., and sister of Louis XIII., kings of France—a lady of much beauty and vivacity, and destined to acquire a complete ascendancy over her husband; but the marriage was regarded by many with alarm, as it was stipulated that the queen, with all the children of the marriage, and all her domestics, should be secured in the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion; that she should have a bishop, invested with all necessary authority in things relating to religion, with twenty-eight priests or monks, and a chapel in every place where she should happen to reside; and that she should have the education of her children till they were thirteen years of age.[1]

Charles was virtuous in his life, punctual in the discharge of his religious duties, possessed of good abilities, many accomplishments, a deep earnestness of character, and a dignity of demeanour becoming a king; but he soon showed that he had imbibed high notions of the royal prerogative—that he was fond of circumstance and ceremony in religious worship—that he hated puritanism—and did not feel himself bound to keep faith with his subjects. Foolishly involved in a war, first with Spain, and afterwards with France, his Commons refused him such supplies as he required till he would redress their grievances, and give some secure resting-place to that spirit of liberty which was now abroad. Parliament after parliament was called, only to be dissolved; and the mortified king, baulked of his subsidies, was obliged to resort to forced loans from his subjects to meet the exigencies of the State. The elements of strife were already in existence; bishops were preaching about the divine right of kings and the duty of passive obedience; members of parliament were speaking about the liberties of the subject and the oppressions of the court; and it was becoming evident that a struggle between the old and the new ideas was at hand.

Soon after Charles had ascended the throne, and before his character was fully developed, the Scottish ministers despatched

---

[1] Rapin, vol. ix. pp. 586-601, 8vo ed., 1732. Court and Times of Charles I.

one of their number to court, with a petition to the effect, that they might be relieved from the observance of the Articles of Perth; but on the return of their messenger, they discovered that no relief need be looked for, and that the young king was resolved to pursue his father's policy.[1] His revocation of all Crown grants of ecclesiastical property made before he was eight months king showed that he contemplated ecclesiastical changes. Charles, however, was too much occupied with English affairs to be able to give much attention to Scotland, and the Church for several years enjoyed comparative quiet. No General Assembly had met since that disastrous one at Perth; but General Assemblies had not yet been legally abrogated. The bishops continued to exercise their Episcopal power, but they appear to have done it with moderation. Presbyteries were still held. The Anglican method of administering the sacrament was followed by some, and by others it was not. Thus on Easter Day 1627, when the Communion was given in the High Church of Edinburgh, not more than six or seven persons kneeled, and even some of the ministers refrained from doing so.[2] In February 1629, the ministers of Edinburgh again resolved to give the sacrament to the people, as they had not received it in the preceding year; "but it was given," says the historian, "with such confusion that it was pitiful to behold; some of the ministers kneeling, some sitting, some standing, and such confusion among the people also; the minister giving the elements out of his hands to each one, and the reader reading, or the people singing at the same time."[3] It was the same with the other Articles of Perth, which appear to have been like an apple of discord thrown into the midst of the Church. Thus, on Christmas Day, John Maxwell, who was aspiring to a bishopric, was preaching in Edinburgh, and thundering forth invectives and curses against such as would not keep the festivals of the Church; David Forrester was preaching in Leith on the same day, and maintaining the very opposite. "It was sad," says John Row, "to hear pulpit against pulpit; but we should bless the Lord that there were still some to stand in the gap, and speak for the truth and the cause of God."[4]

In the year 1633 Charles visited his ancient kingdom of Scotland, to be crowned with the crown of his ancestors. On Saturday, the 15th of June, he entered Edinburgh in triumphal

---

[1] Bishop Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 7.

[2] Row's History, p. 343.

[3] Ibid, p 348.

[4] Ibid, p. 350.

procession. In his train was Dr Laud, at that time Bishop of London, and soon afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury—a man violent, vain, superstitious, and whose restless and innovating spirit had long ago been recognised by King James.[1] He had now become the adviser of his more infatuated son. On Sunday he preached before the king and court in the Chapel of Holyrood House; he expatiated upon the benefits of conformity; he extolled the venerable ceremonies of the Anglican Church; and the nobles, knowing that the bishop only spoke the sentiments of the king, applauded what he said.[2] Tuesday, the 18th of the month, was fixed for the coronation. By the direction of Laud, an altar was erected in the Abbey Church, parallel to the mass altar, unlighted candles were placed upon it, and otherwise the building was magnificently adorned. The Bishop of Brechin preached the sermon, and the Archbishop of St Andrews placed the crown upon the king's head with the usual forms. Close by the side of the Archbishop of St Andrews the Archbishop of Glasgow had taken his place, as was his right; but Laud, observing that he did not wear the embroidered robe, which the High Church fashion required, thrust him aside, and put the Bishop of Ross in his stead.[3] In this little episode we have a prophetic revelation of the future primate's character and history.

On Sunday, the 23rd of June, the king went to the High Church of Edinburgh to hear sermon. When he had taken his place in the loft, the reader, according to the usage then prevalent, began to read the lessons for the day, and sing the psalms preparatory to the sermon, but Maxwell, one of the ministers of Edinburgh, and recently made Bishop of Ross, requested him to leave his desk, and then substituted in his stead two English chaplains, clothed in surplices, who performed the English service. The service being ended, the Bishop of Moray, also clothed in a surplice, ascended the pulpit and preached.[4] The Scottish people bore these insults upon their established worship in no pleasant humour. The storm was slowly gathering, but it was not yet ready to burst.

The next day being St John the Baptist's Day, his Majesty went in state to his chapel royal, and made a solemn offertory.

---

[1] Memorial of Archbishop Williams, by Bishop Hacket. (See Burton's History, chap. lxvi.)

[2] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 64.

[3] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 562. Rushworth's Collections, part ii. p. 182.

[4] Row's History, p. 363.

The next scene was a characteristic one. About a hundred persons, afflicted with the king's evil, approached, one after another, to his Majesty, and received his healing touch, and at the same time had a piece of gold, coined for the purpose, and suspended by a white riband, put round their necks by the royal hands in commemoration of their cure.[1] So the time passed, amid religious pageants, costly banquets, excursions to the provinces, and bestowal of titles of honour. These last were given with no niggard hand, and yet many expectants were disappointed. During his stay in the country, his Majesty created one marquis, ten earls, two viscounts, eight lords, and dubbed fifty-four knights;[2] thus plenteously did the fountain of honour overflow. Edinburgh he erected into a bishopric; appointed St Gile's to be its cathedral church; and gave pain to the lovers of Presbyterian preaching, by ordering the partitions which divided the church to be taken down, that the building might wear a cathedral-like aspect, and be fit for the cathedral service.[3]

But we have still to record the most important event connected with his Majesty's visit to the north—the meeting of parliament. It was on the 19th of June that the Estates assembled. On the first day the Lords of the Articles were chosen, and continued their labours for more than a week, and certainly they could not have been idle, for they gave their sanction to one hundred and seventy-six acts of a private nature, and to thirty-one relating to public affairs.[4] On the 28th, the parliament met to give its stamp of approbation to the labours of its committee. When the acts were read over there were two which were seen to be destructive of the last traces of presbytery, and which met with a determined opposition.[5]

The first of these was a combination of two acts passed in the reign of King James, the one extending his prerogative to all causes, spiritual as well as political, and the other giving him power to prescribe the apparel of Churchmen; the second was the virtual ratification of the Episcopal government and worship, as it then existed in Scotland. Contrary to what we would imagine, the reluctance was greatest to continue to

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, vol. ii. p. 201. Large Declaration, p. 11.

[2] Balfour, vol. ii. p. 202.

[3] Row's History, p. 369. Stevenson's History, vol. i. p. 121.

[4] Murray's Collection of the Acts of the Scottish Parliament.

[5] Charles I., parl. i. chapters iii. iv.

Charles the power which had been given to James to determine the clerical costumes. Lord Rothes, who led the opposition, said he could consent to the first part of the act, but not to the second. He was told it must be passed as a whole, or not at all. People declared that the device was like to that of the Roman emperors, who placed a statue of some heathen divinity near to the statue of themselves, that the early Christians, in paying obeisance to the one, might be entrapped into an act of homage to the other.[1] The truth is, there was a well-grounded alarm that Laud wished to introduce the surplice, and all those other sacerdotal vestments which, in the minds of the Scottish people, were inseparably joined with the Popish worship. When the vote was taken, the king supplied himself with a roll of the members and a pen, and marked the suffrage of every individual, which had its effect upon the timid and time-serving, but was felt to be unworthy of a king presiding in his parliament. The clerk-register declared the acts to be carried. Rothes stood up and declared the vote to be otherwise. The king interfered, and said, that to corrupt the parliamentary records was high treason, and that therefore Lord Rothes must either be silent, or make good his charge at the peril of his life. The earl prudently declined to run such a hazard, and the matter is involved in mystery to this day.[2]

A number of ministers, when they heard that such acts were being prepared by the Lords of the Articles, drew up a statement of their grievances, to be laid before the parliament, but it was never allowed to see the light.[3] After the obnoxious measures were passed, some of the barons who had voted in the opposition prepared a most respectfully-worded supplication to be presented to his Majesty, explaining their conduct.[4] The Earl of Rothes showed a copy of the proposed supplication to the king at Dalkeith to see if it would be agreeable to him, but the king having glanced at it, returned it to the earl, saying, sharply, "No more of this, my lord, I command you."[5] There was no more of it—the petition was suppressed. But

---

[1] Kirkton's History, p. 29.

[2] Row's History, p. 367. Large Declaration, published in the king's name, but known to be the production of Dr Balcanquhal, Dean of Durham, p. 12.

[3] Row, p. 357.

[4] Stevenson gives a copy of this document, vol. i. pp. 104-11. Row also gives it, pp. 376-81.

[5] Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 9.

about a year afterwards, when everybody had forgotten all about it, Lord Balmerino happened to show a copy of it, which he had lying beside him, to a Dundee writer, who was visiting at his house. The writer, unknown to Balmerino, took a copy of it, and showed it to Hay of Naughton; Hay of Naughton showed it to the Archbishop of St Andrews; the archbishop sent it to the king; and, for possessing such a document, Balmerino was summoned before a criminal court, indicted on an old statute against leasing; found guilty by a majority of one; condemned to death; and saved from the scaffold only by the clemency of the king, who probably felt that his execution would be no better than a murder.[1] The whole proceedings made a deep impression upon the public mind. It was another drop added to the cup of bitterness which was so soon to overflow.

But while we may blame the parliament of 1633 for bolstering up Episcopacy and arbitrary power, we should never forget that we owe to it the settlement of the vexatious tithe-question on the footing according to which all stipends are now paid, and the legal establishment of the parochial school system, which has conferred such inestimable blessings on the country. We shall be pardoned for making a short digression on these two matters.

Soon after the Reformation, the Protestant Church claimed as her proper inheritance the whole lands and tithes of the Roman clergy, to be applied to the maintenance of preachers, the education of the young, and the support of the poor. This equitable claim was never conceded by a nobility anxious to appropriate to themselves the wealth of the hierarchy; but in 1561 it was arranged that the Papal incumbents should be allowed to retain two-thirds of their benefices for life, and that the remaining third should be appropriated partly for the support of the Protestant preachers, and partly to meet the necessities of an impoverished court. The commissioners appointed to allocate the stipends of the new ministers proved niggardly, and the small pittances which they assigned were so irregularly paid, that the Church, though wielding great power, was sunk in abject poverty. To rectify this grievance, often and loudly complained of by the General Assembly, the Regent Moray in his first parliament gave to the Church the power of appointing its own collectors of the thirds, made its claim prior to all others, and declared this was to endure only

---

[1] Guthrie's Memoirs, pp. 9, 10. Row, pp. 381-85.

till the Church should come to its proper patrimony—the teinds. The finances of the ministers were considerably improved by this measure; but the Regent Morton, when he came into power, managed to persuade the Assembly to resign the collection of the thirds into his hands, with the promise that he would assign to every minister a sufficient stipend out of the tithes of his own parish—a thing most ardently desired; but the ministers soon found that they had been deceived, that their stipends were not improved, and that one minister was frequently obliged to take the charge of four, five, or six parishes, assisted by readers paid at the rate of fifty or sixty merks. The avarice of Morton had done this, and it lost him the good-will of the Church, which might have served him in his hour of need.

Things remained long in this state: hundreds of parishes were unprovided with ministers, and hundreds of ministers were but poorly paid. The Assemblies were continually grumbling; the king was frequently promising; scheme of adjustment after scheme was proposed, but proposed only to be abandoned. Meantime, the recovery of the Church's patrimony was becoming every day more hopeless. The great majority of the parishes had been gifted in Roman Catholic times to the bishoprics and abbeys. As the Roman abbots died out, lay commendators were generally appointed in their stead, and many of these prevailed upon the king to convert their titles into heritable rights. After a time, when men's minds had got so accustomed to plunder that they could do it without a cloak, the decent form of appointing commendators was given up, and the king, in virtue of his royal right, and with reprehensible prodigality, gave large grants of the Church's revenues to his nobles. These lucky men were styled Lords of Erection. They generally received their grants under the burden of the thirds which had been appropriated to the ministers; but this specific burden was sometimes discharged on the vague condition that competent stipends should be provided out of the teinds for the ministers of the parishes out of which they were drawn, and sometimes on no condition at all.[1] We have seen how several of the bishoprics were held by courtiers, who drew their revenues, and employed a stipendiary tulchan to do the work.

In 1587 James VI., in order to replenish an impoverished exchequer, resolved to annex the lands of all ecclesiastical

[1] Connel on Tithes, vol. i. p. 182.

benefices to the Crown. This act extended only to the lands, and not to the tithes of the Church : it, moreover, reached only to the soil still in possession of the Church, and not to that which had already been gifted to laymen ; but as none of the bishoprics had yet been erected into temporal lordships, and as many of the abbacies granted during the king's minority were only given during pleasure, the statute was felt to be very comprehensive in its sweep. The king afterwards regretted the passing of this act, as it opposed a barrier to the restoration of bishops, by depriving them of that wealth which becomes them so well. Bishops, however, were restored, and the Parliament House as well as the Church opened its doors for them ; but notwithstanding the efforts and sacrifices of the king, and the recission of the act of annexation, they were far from enjoying the ancient opulence of their order.

During all the struggle between Episcopacy and Presbytery, the ministers continued to be paid out of the thirds of benefices, and their stipends rose or fell according to the dispositions of the modificators. It was 1617 before any important change was effected. In that year a commission was issued by parliament for settling ministers' stipends, founded on a principle which had been proposed to the General Assembly in 1596. The act proceeds on the narrative, "That there be divers kirks within this kingdom not planted with ministers, on account of which ignorance and atheism abound among the people ; and that many of those that are planted have no sufficient provision or maintenance appointed to them, whereby the ministry are kept in poverty and contempt, and cannot fruitfully travel in their charges." A mixed commission of prelates, nobles, barons, and burgesses was therefore named, with power "out of the teinds of every parish, to appoint and assign at their discretion a perpetual local stipend to the ministers present and to come." By this act the stipend of every minister was ordained to be paid, not out of a general fund as before, but out of the tithes of the parish where he laboured ; the minimum stipend to be assigned was fixed at 5 chalders of victual, or 500 merks, and the maximum at 8 chalders, or 800 merks.[1] This act was felt to be a step toward putting the stipends of the clergy on a proper footing.

---

[1] We have here a proof of how rapidly money had depreciated in Scotland. In 1560 the value of 5 chalders of victual was only about 100 merks ; in 1617 it is 500. It is a symptom of the rapid improvement which had begun and was going on. At present the average value of 5 chalders of victual is upwards of 1500 merks.

Things continued in this state till Charles I. came to the throne in 1625. He found that, by the thoughtless prodigality of his father, almost the entire Church property of Scotland had been gifted away, and resolved to execute a revocation of all such grants, which he did in the very first year of his reign. Almost every noble family in Scotland had some share in the spoil; many of them had held it beyond the years of prescription; some of them if stripped of it would be left almost naked in the world, and therefore the king's design of wrenching it from them caused universal agitation and alarm, combined with a determination to resist. Bishop Burnet tells of how at a meeting with the king's commissioners regarding surrenders, a blind Lord Belhaven asked to be placed beside the Earl of Dumfries, whom he held with the one hand, while he secretly clutched a poinard in the other, that he might make sure of one man if the surrenders were pressed. To counterbalance this spirit, Charles attempted to interest the gentry and clergy in his project, by holding out to the former the right of purchasing and leading their own teinds; and to the latter, the prospect of more liberal stipends.

The king subsequently narrowed the wide range of his revocation, and then ordered a summons of reduction to be raised, as he conceived that the grants could be reduced upon legal grounds. Alarmed at this proceeding, a deputation of the titulars was sent to London, and had a conference with his Majesty. In consequence of the agreement then come to, the king, on the 7th of January 1627, issued a commission to the Lord Chancellor, the Lord High Treasurer, the two archbishops, eight bishops, twenty-two nobles, three law lords, seventeen barons, and ten burgesses, to treat with all who pretended a right to erected benefices for a surrender of these to the Crown, on such terms as the commissioners should suggest. This commission continued its sittings and its labours during the whole summer of that year; and amongst other things, decided that all superiorities of erection should be resigned into his Majesty's hands, his Majesty being left to determine what composition should be paid for the rent of the superiorities; and it was further agreed that this, and the questions which had arisen in regard to the valuation and sale of teinds, should be finally adjusted and determined by decreets-arbitral, pronounced by the king, and proceeding upon submissions by all the parties concerned. Accordingly, in the course of the year 1628, submissions were given in by the

Lords of Erection and the landholders, by the bishops and clergy, by the royal burghs having interest, and, last of all, by certain tacksmen and others having right to teinds.

Everything was now ripe for a decision, and accordingly, on the 2d of September 1629, his Majesty pronounced four decreets-arbitral, corresponding to the number of submissions. With regard to the superiorities of Church lands, it was ordained that 1000 merks Scots should be paid by the Crown for each chalder of victual feu-duty, and for each 100 merks of money feu-duty. With regard to teinds, the decreet declares, "that it is necessary and expedient for the public welfare and peace of this our ancient kingdom, and for the better providing of kirks and ministers' stipends and for the establishing of schools and other pious uses, that each heritor have and enjoy his own teinds;" and in order to this, it is provided that all teinds should be valued and sold to those heritors who should choose to purchase them. The fifth of the rental of the land was declared to be the value of the teind;[1] and the price of teinds thus valued was fixed at nine years' purchase—a price which would be remarkably low now, but which probably was not so then.[2] It was farther provided, that in calculating the price of teinds, heritors were to pay for no more than what should remain after the ministers' stipends were deducted; and also that a certain portion of the rent or price, to be fixed by commissioners, should be set apart for the king in name of annuity.

In order to understand this arrangement, it must be remembered that teinds were originally levied out of the yearly produce of the farm. The parson, or his tacksman, went to the corn-field in harvest time, and carried off every tenth sheaf as his own. After the Reformation the lay titulars were found to be more rigorous in the exaction of tithes than their ecclesiastical predecessors, and their exaction was not so patiently borne. No victual could be taken from the field till it was first teinded; and a careless or ill-disposed titular or tacksman might let the crop rot in the stook before he appeared to claim his right, a grievance which was sorely felt, and only partially removed by statutes limiting the time for the removal of the teind. The

---

[1] When the teinds were drawn from the land separately, they were to be valued by a proof of the teind as drawn; but the fifth of the rental may be said to have been the general rule. (Connel, vol. i. p. 226.)

[2] The Commissioners on Teinds in their report gave instances of land being sold at that period at nine years' purchase. Still it is a question often debated how far the sum fixed was a fair value for the teinds.

land-owners were now to be enabled to rid themselves of this annoyance, by buying their own teinds, subject to the payment of such a stipend as should be granted to the minister.

The parliament of 1633 gave its sanction to these proceedings, and they became law. Sub-commissioners were soon at work in every presbytery over the country, and a considerable proportion of the teinds valued; but, strange to say, it was long before many of the proprietors availed themselves of the right to purchase. The minister of religion required no longer to haunt the harvest-field, and perhaps quarrel with the farmer about his teinding; nor to peep into the sheepcots, lest he should be cheated of his proportion of the lambs and the wool: the fifth part of the rental of the land was declared to be the value of the teind, and so much of this was assigned to the minister as the commissioners of teinds thought good. The arrangement was in many respects a wise one, but now circumstances have so outgrown it that it leads to gross injustices. In many cases the fifth part of the value of land then is not the fiftieth part now. Moreover, as a rule, the great landowners got their lands valued at any price they chose to put on them, whereas the "bonnet lairds," unable to afford the expense, took no steps to have a valuation put on their small holdings; and the result now is, that the bonnet laird frequently pays stipend according to the present valuation of his land, while his great neighbour pays according to the valuation of two hundred and sixty years ago. In this way, ten acres sometimes pay more than a thousand; the poor man is plundered, while the rich man escapes; and a burden which, if equally distributed, would be light as a feather, falls upon some with a crushing load.

By these measures the king no doubt wished to benefit the clergy, and he in fact anticipated the commutation of tithes which took place in England and Ireland two centuries later. But the arrangement, though meant to be beneficial for the Church, was not hailed with universal satisfaction. Many of the nobles surrendered their teinds with a grudge. It is said to have so embittered the minds of some as to have led them to take part in the troubles which followed, and that the deed of revocation was the root of the rebellion.[1] It is very probable that this is partly true, and we need not wonder at it.

---

[1] The king expressly affirms this in his Large Declaration, pp. 6-10; and Sir John Connel has an interesting note at p. 216 of his Treatise, referring to the same subject.

It would be the same now if those nobles who still hold ecclesiastical plunder were asked to surrender; it would make loyal men disloyal, peaceful men turbulent, it would almost make sane men mad. We should rather blame the profuseness which gifted the property, than the tenacity which was unwilling to render it back again. That such passions should mingle in the strife we need not wonder; for the purest gold has ever an admixture of alloy, and the holiest of causes has frequently its sinful partisans.

We venture to make another digression in regard to the origin of our school system, as it was the parliament of 1633 which first propped it up and strengthened it by statute. In Roman Catholic times, the means of education in Scotland were very scanty. The Universities of St Andrews, Glasgow, and Aberdeen had been established, grammar schools existed in some of the principal towns, and the convents were less or more nurseries of learning, but no provision had as yet been made for educating the bulk of the people. James IV. compelled all barons and freeholders to send their eldest sons to school, to be instructed in law, Latin, and the arts;[1] but it is certain that even such humble acquirements as reading and writing were rare among the masses. There is a shade of suspicion that some of the clergy could not correctly read, and much less write, though, as a body, they were undoubtedly the best educated class of the community.[2] The Reformers showed their anxiety to extend education, by making that one of the great objects to which they proposed the property of the Church should be consecrated. In the "First Book of Discipline" it was proposed that every church should have a school attached to it; that every notable town should have a college; and that the existing universities should be liberally endowed. The greed of the nobles prevented the scheme from being carried into effect, and with them rests the sin and

---

[1] James IV., parl. v. chap. liv.

[2] In the Records of the Kirk-session of St Andrews, which are coeval with the Reformation, we have the recantation of a great number of monks and others. Of the signatures attached to these recantations some are specially marked *propria manu*, which gives rise to the suspicion that the other names were written by deputy. See Maitland Miscellany, vol. ii. One of the proclamations of the Lords of the Congregation regarding the use of the Prayer-Book of Edward VI., uses language which makes us marvel if it were possible there might be clerics who could not even read: they speak of those not qualified to read the common prayers. The canons of the Council of 1559, already quoted, confirm the suspicion.

the shame of keeping Scotland for many years longer in gross ignorance.

The grammar schools, which had been founded in papal days, still remained, and gave a good education to the upper classes; the universities struggled on amid many difficulties; but the readers seem to have been the only educators of the rural districts. These humble but useful men read the appointed lessons and prayers in the church upon the Sunday; during the week, they instructed the children of the peasantry in the Catechism and the Bible; and thus picked up such a livelihood as they could. They are the first parents of our parish schoolmasters. In the "Diary" of James Melville, we have some most interesting notices of the school of Montrose, in which he was a scholar six years after the Reformation. "There," says he, "was a guid nomber of gentle and honest men's berns,[1] of the countrey about, weill treaned[2] upe, bathe in letters, godliness, and exerceise of honest geams.[3] There we lerned to reid the Catechisme, Prayers, and Scripture; to rehers the Catechisme and Prayers *par cœur;* also nottes of Scripture, efter the reiding therof." . . . "We lerned there the 'rudiments of the Latin grammair,' with the vocables in Latin and Frenche; also divers speitches in Frenche, with the reiding and right pronunciation of that toung. We proceidit fordar to the 'Etymologie' of Lilius and his 'Syntax,' as also a little of the 'Syntax' of Linacer; therewith was joyned Hunters 'Nomenclatura,' the 'Minora Colloquia' of Erasmus, and sum of the 'Eclogs' of Virgill and 'Epistles' of Horace; also Cicero, his 'Epistles *ad Terentiam.*'" It would thus appear that boys had their "rudiments" to learn, and their "Virgils" and "Ciceros" to read, then as now; no advance whatever has been made in grammar school education in these three hundred years. But it is refreshing to know that they had their play too. "Ther also," continues Melville, "we haid the aire guid, and fields reasonable fear;[4] and be our maister war teached to handle the bow for archerie, the glub for goff, the batons for fencing; also to rin, to loop, to swoum, to warsell,[5] to prove pratteiks, everie ane haiffing[6] his matche and andagoniste bathe in our lessons and play. A happie and a golden tyme!" says the good man, as the dream of his school-boy days rose up before him.[7]

---

[1] Bairns, children. [2] Well trained. [3] Games.
[4] Fair. [5] To run, leap, swim, wrestle. [6] Having.
[7] Melville's Diary, p. 14.

It would appear that music had been much cultivated up to this period, though now it was beginning to fall into neglect; but still there were many "sang schoolis" scattered over the country. That the first reformers were anxious to encourage sacred music is evident from the fact that the first editions of the Scottish Liturgy have the Psalm-tunes then sung attached to the Psalms, and curiously reversed, on the opposite pages, so that two persons standing opposite to each other might sing from the same book. In the year 1579, King James had an act passed for instructing the youth in the art of singing and music, "quhilk is like to fall in great decay, without timous remeid be provided." "Our sovereign lord, therefore, with advice of his Three Estates of this present parliament, requests the provosts, bailies, councils, and communities of the most special burghs of the realm, and the patrons and provosts of the colleges where 'sang schools' are founded, to erect and set up a sang school, with a master sufficient and able for the instruction of the youth in the said science of music, as they will answer to his Highness upon the peril of their foundations."[1] About the same date, we have, in the "Burgh Records of Glasgow," an entry for the rent of a room used as a "sang school;"[2] and in other documents of that time, we have several scattered notices of a similar kind.

James Melville was something of a musician, and tells us that he acquired his knowledge of it at St Andrews from a man who had been trained up among the monks in the abbey; that he learned from him the gammot, plain song and treble of the Psalms; that he loved singing and playing on instruments passing well; that he delighted to be present at the performances in the college; that some of his fellow-students played "fell weell" on the virginals, and others on the lute and githorn; and that the regent had a spinet in his room, to which he sometimes resorted, and played an accompaniment.[3] It was the Church that had fostered this pleasing art; and the daily cathedral service, the solemn chanting of the monks in their conventual buildings, and the way in which the Roman ritual had so beautifully blended music with almost every act of religious worship, diffused a love of it among the

---

[1] James VI., parl. vi. chap. xcviii.

[2] Burgh Records of Glasgow, published in the Appendix to Papers Illustrative of Queen Mary and King James, Maitland Club. "1578.—For male of ane chalmer to be ane sang schole."

[3] Diary, p. 23.

people. It is probable that some of those touchingly simple Scottish airs, of unknown antiquity, which give such perfect utterance to the finest feelings of the Scottish heart, may first have been sung by young men and maidens who learned from monks the concord of sweet sounds. After the Reformation music decayed, though it had still its votaries, as it will have in all ages.

When we reach the beginning of the seventeenth century, we find that the Presbyterian clergy had done much for the establishment of schools, considering that they were without the means of endowing them. Thus, it appears from the report of a visitation of a number of parishes in the Diocese of St Andrews, in the years 1611 and 1613, that considerably more than one-half of these were blessed with schools.

The parliament had confided to the Church the superintendence of schools, though it had denied it the means of endowing them; and, in the records of the Church Courts, there is evidence that the duty was not neglected. At the visitation of parishes by the presbyteries and provincial synods, the state of education was inquired into; the qualifications of the teachers were tried; and where there was no school, steps were sometimes taken for establishing one. The presbytery did not hesitate to tax every plough of land for the support of the schoolmaster. The kirk-session of Anstruther-Wester went farther, and made an order for every child in the town to attend school: if the rich refused, they were to be called before the session; if the poor refused, they were to be denied any charity. It was still further considerately provided, that the children of the poor were to be educated at the expense of the town, and that three hours every day were to be allowed them to go about and beg for their food—a circumstance which reminds us of the schoolboy days of Martin Luther.[1]

At length in 1616 the Privy Council put forth its authority to confer upon the country the blessing of education, and by an act declared, "That in every parish in this kingdom, where convenient means may be had for entertaining a school, a school shall be established, and a fit person appointed to teach the same, upon the expense of the parishioners, according to the quality and quantity of the parish;" that this was to be done at the sight and by the advice of the bishops; and, accordingly, "that they and every one of them deal and travel with the parishioners of the particular parishes within their

---

[1] Appendix to Dr M'Crie's Life of Melville.

particular dioceses, to condescend and agree upon some certain, solid, and sure course how and by what means the said school might be entertained."

The act of the Council does not seem to have been rigorously followed up by the bishops; for ten years afterwards a proclamation was made, ordering all ministers, with the assistance of two or three of their most intelligent parishioners, to report as to the state of their parishes;[1] and from the returns which have been preserved, and are now published by the Maitland Club, the condition of education appears in a worse light than in the documents to which we have already referred. The great majority of the parishes are reported as having no school. In many cases "the most intelligent parishioners" chosen to assist the minister in making his report were unable to sign their names; and of one parish the significant report is—"There is ane greit necissatie for ane skule, for not ane of the paroche can reid nor wryt except the minister."[2] Such is the dark picture of the state of education in Scotland little more than two hundred years ago; but the parliament of 1633 ratified the Act of Council of 1616; the clergy followed it up; schools began to be built and endowed, and the people to grow in intelligence; but it was not till after the Revolution of 1688 that the proprietors of every parish were compelled to furnish the means of education to every child.

Having thus wandered twice from the straight path of our history, we must now return to it.

The excitement caused by the visit of the king, and the meeting of the parliament, had long ago subsided; Lord Balmerino had been tried, condemned, reprieved, and the public sympathy had accordingly abated. There was still the deep grudge in the minds of many of the nobles at being compelled to surrender their teinds, and a degree of irritation kept up among the Presbyterian ministers by the proceedings of the Court of Commission, but the country was marvellously quiet. During the year 1634, several of the bishops were made Judges in the Court of Exchequer, and Privy Councillors; at the same time many of the inferior clergy received commissions to act with the gentry as justices of the peace; and, upon the death of the Earl of Kinnoull,

---

[1] This is noticed by Row in his History, p. 343.

[2] Reports of the State of certain Parishes in Scotland, 1627, Maitland Club.

in the beginning of 1635, the Archbishop of St Andrews was raised to the high office of Chancellor of the Kingdom[1]—a dignity which had very generally been held by ecclesiastics in Roman Catholic times, but which, since the Reformation, had been always held and eagerly coveted by the greatest nobles. These haughty peers had, for the last seventy years, been accustomed to look down upon the ministers of religion as a race of men very inferior to themselves, and now they could ill brook to see them placed by their side, or even over their head. In the meantime, however, they were obliged to bear the affront with what patience they could.

We now approach the most exciting period of Scotch history. Long ago, James VI., in his burning desire to have uniformity of worship throughout the kingdom, had resolved to introduce into Scotland the Anglican Liturgy, or one like unto it. At his royal request, the Assembly of 1617 had agreed that a liturgy should be prepared; but he afterwards found that he had quite enough to do in compelling obedience to the Articles of Perth, and the liturgy was allowed to drop. Charles, however, inherited his father's resolve to have religious uniformity, and when he came to Scotland, the question of the liturgy was revived. It was understood that Laud had accompanied him for the special purpose of helping him in the work. When the matter was talked over with the bishops and Anglicising clergy, some urged the introduction of the Anglican liturgic forms while the king was in the country, but Charles does not seem to have thought that the fulness of the time was come, and so the Church was allowed to enjoy its own ritual a little longer. One of the reasons for delay was this. It was stated that Scotland was sensitively afraid of sinking into a mere English province; that the imposition of the English liturgy would give strength to this feeling; and that it would be more flattering to the national vanity to have a liturgy of native growth. In compliance with these views, a commission was given to the Scotch bishops to prepare a liturgy as near as might be to the Anglican one.[2]

It has too often been supposed that Scotland at this period had no liturgy of her own, and that the Scottish clergy and people were opposed to all liturgical forms whatever. This is a mistake. Scotland had never been without a "Book of Common Prayer." Even before the Reformation was estab-

---

[1] Row, Balfour, Guthrie.

[2] Clarendon's History, vol. i. pp. 65, 66.

lished by law, the "Service Book" of Edward VI. was used in many of the parishes where Reformation principles prevailed. After Protestantism became the creed of the nation, the "Book of Common Order," prepared by Knox for the English congregation at Geneva, came into use, was sanctioned by several Assemblies, and continued the authorised form of worship up to the time we speak of. In 1601 the Assembly of Burntisland showed its veneration for the prayers by refusing to allow them to be altered. In 1605 Robert Bruce, the exile from Edinburgh for his high Presbyterianism, was accustomed to read them every other night to the little flock which had gathered around him at Inverness.[1] The Assembly of 1616 appointed a committee to revise the Prayer Book and bring it into harmony with royal and Episcopal views.[2] In 1620 Scrymgeour, when summoned before the Court of High Commission for not observing the Articles of Perth, pleaded that there was "no warrantable form directed or approven by the Kirk, besides that which is extant in print, before the Psalm Book (Knox's liturgy), according to which," said he "as I have always done, so now I minister the sacrament."[3] On the very day on which the riot took place on account of the introduction of the new liturgy, the lessons from the old liturgy had already been read in the Church of St Gile's;[4] and Bishop Sage affirms that there were many old people alive even in his day, who remembered to have seen it used after the civil wars, both by Prelatists and Presbyterians.[5] It was not till the Westminster Assembly met, and the "Directory for Public Worship" was adopted, that the Church of Scotland discarded a liturgy, and even then it was never formally repudiated or repealed; it was quietly allowed to drop into disuse.[6] But as many clergymen do not follow the "Directory for Public Worship" now, it is probable that many did not follow the Genevese forms in the beginning of the seventeenth century. The rubric gave ministers the liberty of deviating

---

[1] Calderwood's History, vol. vi. pp. 291, 292.

[2] There is a MS. Liturgy in the British Museum, which Mr Burton supposes to be identical with the one which emanated from that committee. History, vol. vi.

[3] Calderwood's History, vol. vii. p. 421.

[4] Row's History, p. 408.

[5] Sage's Charter of Presbytery, p. 352.

[6] Wodrow, in his Correspondence, mentions that Calderwood recommended that the Assembly should not discard the liturgy, but allow it to fall into disuse. There is no act of Assembly repudiating it.

from the set forms; and as extemporaneous prayer was becoming more and more prized, it is likely that the rubrical license was largely taken advantage of. It is impossible to determine how far the "Common Order" was attended to, and how far it was set aside; but it is probable it was used by all the readers and a majority of the ministers, while by others it was either entirely repudiated, or at most very slightingly observed.

In the year 1636, the "Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical for the Government of the Church of Scotland" appeared.[1] They were published by authority, and an instrument was issued under the Great Seal, in which it was declared that his Majesty ratified the said Canons and Constitutions, and commanded all invested with ecclesiastical authority to see them observed. In a short time copies of the book were in the hands of most of the ministers, and loud murmurs began to be heard, that rules so subversive of their discipline, so repugnant to their belief, should be imposed upon them by the king alone, without the interposition of any ecclesiastical court. It was, indeed, pretended that the Canons were but an epitome of the acts of the Assembly;[2] but this was a mockery: it can scarcely be called a delusion and a snare, for no person could be deceived by it, so unlike were the one to the other. It was the decalogue with the negative struck out; the creed with a negative put in. A font for baptism was to be provided, and placed near the door of the church, as in Papal times; a table for the administration of the eucharist was to be placed in the upper end of the chancel, and covered with an embroidered cloth, except when the sacrament was to be dispensed; the consecrated elements were to be carefully handled, and what remained was to be eaten by the poor before leaving the church; all private religious meetings were forbidden, as unlawful conventicles; assemblies, synods, presbyteries, kirk-sessions, and elders were ignored, and the parish alms were to

---

[1] "Canons and Constitutions Ecclesiastical; gathered and put in forme for the Government of the Church of Scotland. Ratified and approved by his Majesty's Royall Warrand, and ordained to be observed by the Clergie, and all others whom they may concern. Published by authoritie. Aberdene. Imprinted by Edward Raban, dwelling upon the Market Place at the Arms of the Citie. 1636. With Royall Priviledge."

[2] The way had been paved for this high stretch of royal prerogative by an Act of the Assembly of 1616 to form a collection of "Ecclesiastical Canons, drawn forth of the Books of the former Assemblies, and where the same is defective, to supply it by Canons of Councils and Ecclesiastical Conventions in former times." Scott's Apologetic Narration, p. 243.

be distributed by six respectable men; ordinations were to take place only at the four sacred seasons, the two solstices and the two equinoxes; the preaching deacon was to be introduced, an office hitherto unknown in the Church; no presbyter was to reveal anything told him in confession, unless it endangered his life; no presbyter was to be security for any one in pecuniary matters; no court was to be held, or excommunication pronounced, or absolution given, without the consent of the bishop; every ecclesiastical person dying without children was to leave his estate to pious uses; those who had children were to leave something, to show their affection to the Church; every parish was to provide for itself a Bible of King James' version and a prayer book; and every clergyman must use this Service Book, and refrain from extemporaneous prayer, as he would avoid deprivation.

The "Book of Canons" was followed by the "Book of Common Prayer." This famous liturgy, now generally known as "Laud's Liturgy," is supposed to have been prepared by Maxwell, Bishop of Ross, and Wedderburn, Bishop of Dunblane, and then submitted to the Archbishop of Canterbury for revisal. It is a copy of the English Book of Common Prayer, with a few alterations, which increase its similitude to the Roman missal. Some of these were introduced by the Scotch bishops, but the most offensive ones were the handiwork of Laud.[1] All things being thus ready, proclamation was made at the market-cross of every burgh, charging all men, under pain of horning, to conform themselves to the new form of worship, commanding all bishops and presbyters to see that this was observed, and that every parish procured for its use at least two copies of the Prayer-Book.[2]

The whole country was instantly in a ferment. The people had bowed their necks and sacrificed their feelings more than once to the royal prerogative, but they would do it no more. They declared that the king had no right to impose a liturgy

---

[1] Stevenson, vol. i. p. 154. Kirkton says that he saw the original, with the corrections in the handwriting of Laud, and that they were all toward Popery, bringing the Prayer-Book as near to the Missal as English could be to Latin. (History, p. 30). Mr Burton discusses at great length, and with much learning, the respective parts which these prelates had in the book. Laud, when in trouble, protested that he wished the Scots simply to accept the English Prayer-Book, but that national jealousy prevented this, and hence the changes. (See Burton's History, vol. vi.)

[2] Balfour's Annals, vol. ii. pp. 224, 225. Stevenson's History, vol. i. pp. 173, 174. A copy of the charge prefaced the book.

upon the nation without the consent of the parliament, without the consent of the Assembly of the Church. They declared that the Service-Book was Popish—that it taught baptismal regeneration, transubstantiation, the oblation of the consecrated elements, and was little better than a mass-book.[1]

It is probable that a large proportion of the clergy would have accepted the Service-Book. Episcopacy had now existed for more than thirty years. Almost all the existing incumbents had grown up under its shadow—they had received their ordination from Episcopal hands; they had vowed obedience to Episcopal authority, and must have been inoculated, less or more, with Episcopal notions. But the laity almost as one man cried out against the book.[2] All ranks were agreed in this. Letters from noblemen of the highest standing poured in upon the Lords of the Privy Council, warning them to beware of what they did; and the murmurs of the yeomen and burghers were loud enough to be heard and understood.

A.D. 1637. It had been proposed that the Service-Book should begin to be used at Easter 1637; but such was the state of the nation that the Privy Council took alarm, and wished for delay. The bench of bishops was divided. The older bishops, with Spottiswood at their head—a man wary, wise in his generation, and mindful of the Perth Assembly—were for putting off the evil day; the younger bishops, anxious to ingratiate themselves with Laud, and ignorant of the temper of the people, saw nothing to dread, and were for instant obedience. Easter passed, and in only two or three churches was the liturgy read. The Bishops of Ross, Dunblane, and Brechin led the van. Some ministers had thoughts of beginning to read the liturgy with closed doors.[3]

---

[1] That these were the chief arguments used against the Prayer-Book is abundantly plain from the tenor of the numerous petitions and complaints against it, and also from Row's long argument on the subject. (History, pp. 398-406.) The chief complaints were that it was Popish, and that it was unwarrantably brought in.

[2] Stevenson (vol. i. p. 169) expressly allows this; and the same thing is made more apparent by the fact that only one of the Edinburgh ministers at first refused to read the liturgy. This was Ramsay. He was afterwards joined by Rollock, neither of whom read the order respecting the use of the Prayer-Book. (See Stevenson, vol. i. p. 181.) The extreme anxiety of the king to exclude as much as possible lay influence from the Assembly of 1638 is another proof of the same fact.

[3] Lord Rothes' Relation, pp. 3, 4.

The summer wore on, and still nothing was done. At length the fears of Spottiswood were overcome by some motive not very well understood: some say it was a selfish one; others say it was pure infatuation,[1] for the pulse of the nation now indicated a state of excitement bordering upon madness; yet he not only give way, but obtained a positive order from court to begin the use of the liturgy without delay.

On Sunday, the 16th of July, the ministers of Edinburgh were required to read the order respecting the introduction of the Prayer-Book on the succeeding Sunday. Some refused to do it; some would not do it themselves, but left it to their readers to do. Some read it in such a way as to show it was an unwelcome task; some not only read it, but took the opportunity of extolling the liturgy, which in future was to be the guide of their devotions.[2] The people in general heard the intimation with respectful silence; there was not the slightest disturbance in any of the churches.

Sunday, the 23d of July, came. At the morning service, in the Middle Church of St Gile's, the prayers from the Book of Common Order were read as usual by the reader. At the forenoon service a larger congregation than usual assembled, but it had not the quiet aspect of an assembly met for religious worship; there was a restless excitement in every eye. The Archbishop of St Andrews was present to grace the occasion; and it was known that Lindsay, the Bishop of Edinburgh, was to preach. About ten o'clock the dean, arrayed in a white surplice, entered the reading-desk, and began to read the service for the day from the new Prayer-Book. Instantly a confused murmur crept over the congregation; gradually the sound became more articulate; the people got to their feet, and the whole church was a scene of uproar and confusion. The voices of the women were loudest. Some cried, "Woe! woe!" others, "Sorrow! sorrow! for this doleful day that they are bringing in Popery amongst us!" The bishop went to the pulpit to appease the people, but it was in vain; he could not be heard. The uproar became worse, and an old woman threw the stool upon which she sat at the head of the dean. Another cried, "Will ye say mass at my lug?" The magistrates now interfered, and with some difficulty managed to clear the church of the rioters, and the service was continued with closed doors. But the crowd still remained out-

---

[1] Stevenson, vol. i. pp. 179, 180. Guthrie, p. 18.

[2] Row's History, p. 408.

side. They knocked at the doors, they threw stones in at the windows, they shouted "Popery, Popery!" and called the bishops by every opprobrious name. When the bishop came out of the church, he was hooted and hustled by the rabble, and only rescued from their hands by the servants of the Earl of Wemyss. In the afternoon the service was again attempted, but on this occasion the magistrates had stationed themselves at the doors, and allowed none to enter but such as were likely to be quiet. But the crowd were still prowling about the street in a humour for mischief; and when the bishop came out of the church and got into the coach of the Earl of Roxburgh to be driven to the abbey, he was followed by the mob in full cry. The Tron Church was then building, and supplied abundant material for pelting the obnoxious prelate, who escaped only by the speed of the earl's horses, and the drawn swords of his footmen.[1]

A similar scene, though not quite so violent, had occurred at the Greyfriars, where the Bishop Elect of Argyll officiated. It is certain that these riots were confined to the lowest orders of the populace, and, singularly enough, chiefly to the women. The magistrates of Edinburgh declared this, after making inquiry, and almost all historians say the same thing. It is also certain, however, that the upper and middle classes sympathised with them, and were at that very moment forming their plans for obtaining the same object, though by more constitutional means; but there is no reason to think that they had hounded on the mob to do as they did.[2] It was not necessary. Such outbursts of popular fury generally originate with the rabble, who cannot understand the propriety of petitioning, and instinctively resort to violence. The lowest classes in the State approximate nearest to that condition of society where might is the only vindicator of right. The court and Episcopal party of course cried out

---

[1] I have drawn this description from the accounts given in the Large Declaration, pp. 23-26; Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 20; Row's History, pp. 408, 409; Baillie's Letters and Journal, p. 18; Crawford's Lives, p. 181; Clarendon's History, pp. 87, 88; Gordon's History, &c. The collect for the day (the seventh Sunday after Trinity) is, "Lord of all power and might, who art the author and giver of all good things, graft in our hearts the love of Thy name, increase in us true religion, nourish us with all goodness, and of Thy great mercy keep us in the same, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

[2] Guthrie alone (p. 23) affirms that Alexander Henderson, David Dickson, Lord Balmerino, and the Lord Advocate, concocted the whole affair with some Edinburgh matrons.

against the sacrilege which had been committed—the desecration of God's house and God's service; and even some of the more moderate Presbyterians regretted that things had taken such a turn; but Dr Cook's apology is a good one—the people were really "contributing," says he, "to purify those temples which apparently they profaned."[1]

The bishops instantly sent to London an account of what had happened. Lord Clarendon contemptuously declares that, up to the time when this despatch arrived, "there was so little curiosity either in the court or the country to know anything of Scotland, or what was done there, that when the whole nation was solicitous to know what passed weekly in Germany and Poland, and all other parts of Europe, no man ever inquired what was doing in Scotland, nor had that kingdom a place or mention in one page of any gazette."[2] This obscure corner of the empire was now destined to rise into notice, and to make the courtiers of St James's know that there was a nation existing north of the Tweed. Upon the 30th of July, Charles wrote to the Privy Council, instructing them to use their best endeavours to discover the rioters, and to give their help to the clergy in establishing the use of the liturgy.[3]

The Privy Council had at first resolved to persevere in the use of the Prayer-Book, and in this they were seconded by the magistrates of Edinburgh; and by tuck of drum the people were enjoined to quietness.[4] But they would not be quiet, and the whole country continued in such an excited state, that the Council resolved to discontinue the use of the obnoxious liturgy till the king's pleasure was known; and that the people might not be deprived altogether of religious ordinances, it was agreed that sermons should be preached and prayers offered at the usual times, but that neither the old nor the new Service-Books should be employed.[5] The week-day meetings, however, were discontinued, at which the reader was accustomed to read the appointed prayers, so that Baillie declares Edinburgh looked like a town placed under an ecclesiastical interdict.[6] The king disliked the old Prayer-Book, the people disliked the new, and the consequence of

---

[1] History, vol. ii.

[2] History of the Rebellion, p. 88.

[3] Privy Council Record, 4th August 1637. Peterkin's Records of the Church of Scotland, p. 52.

[4] Privy Council Record, 28th July 1637. Peterkin, pp. 51, 52.

[5] Privy Council Record, 29th July 1637. Peterkin, p. 52.

[6] Letters and Journals.

the quarrel has been to deprive Scotland of a Prayer-Book altogether.

On the 13th of July, proceedings had been commenced against ALEXANDER HENDERSON, minister of Leuchars, and several other clergymen, for not having given obedience to the Privy Council's proclamation in regard to the liturgy. On the 20th of August they presented bills of suspension, on the ground that the recent innovations were illegal, being sanctioned neither by the parliament nor the General Assembly. It was difficult for the Council to answer such an argument, without making statements subversive of the constitution of the kingdom; and therefore, avoiding the general question, they simply found that their proclamation extended only to the purchase of the Prayer-Book, and no farther.[1] It was compulsory, they said, to buy the book, but not to use it. At the same time they wrote to the king that matters had now come to such a pass, that they were unwilling to do anything without his express commands;[2] and delayed any farther answer to the petitions which had been presented to them till the 20th of September, by which time it was hoped that the king's pleasure would be known.

Cowardice was not among the faults of the king, and therefore he did not hesitate as to the course he should pursue. With the advice of Laud, he wrote a sharp letter to the Scottish Council, rebuking them for having suspended for a day the use of the service, and commanding them instantly to resume it.[3] This royal resolution became known before the Council met, and the four or five ministers who had hitherto borne the brunt of the battle were instantly joined by twenty-four nobles, a multitude of the gentry, sixty-six commissioners from towns and parishes, and nearly one hundred of the clergy, who, on the 20th of September, marched in a body to the council-house, to present the petitions against the liturgy which had been poured in from every part of the kingdom.[4] The Council was in a strait betwixt the imperative commands of the king and the threatening aspect of the people; but popular clamour prevailed against despotic power, and they determined still to let the liturgy alone. They delayed giving any answer to the petitions they had

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, vol. ii. pp. 227-29. Peterkin, p. 53. [2] Ibid.

[3] Letter, King to the Privy Council, 10th Sept. 1637. Balfour, vol. ii. pp. 232, 233. Peterkin, p. 54.

[4] Peterkin, Introduction, p. 7.

received till the 20th of October, and commissioned the Duke of Lennox, who was about to start for England, to lay the true state of matters before the king.[1]

In the meantime the country was actively canvassed, and petitions were getting ready from almost every town and district; and towards the 17th of October, when it was expected the king's answer would be known, crowds of people from the provinces came pouring into the metropolis. The important day came, and almost the first thing the expectant multitude heard was a proclamation at the market-cross, dissolving the Council in so far as it was called for ecclesiastical affairs; ordering all strangers to return to their homes within twenty-four hours, under pain of horning; removing the courts of justice from the capital; and condemning a book which had got into circulation, and was said to be poisoning the minds of the people in regard to the ceremonies of the Anglican Church.[2]

The populace were violently incensed by these proclamations, and proceeded to the commission of outrages which makes Baillie declare that they appeared to be possessed of a bloody devil.[3] A mob, in which the women were conspicuous, beset the Bishop of Galloway on the street, and would have probably torn him limb from limb had he not been rescued by some of his friends, and carried into the council-house. But the rioters were not disposed to regard the council-house as a sanctuary. They remained without, and with hootings and howlings demanded that Sydserf and other obnoxious lords should be delivered to them. The Council finding themselves thus besieged by an enraged mob, and feeling, no doubt, as if surrounded by a pack of wolves, scenting at every crevice and seeking for an entrance, despatched a messenger to the magistrates, begging them to come to their help. The messenger found the magistrates in the same evil plight as the Council, and in no condition to render assistance. A section of the mob had taken up their station before their place of meeting; some of them had forced their way into the lobbies and rooms, and threatened that unless the provost and bailies joined the city in opposing the Service-Book, they would burn the house about

---

[1] Balfour, vol. ii. pp. 233-35. Peterkin, pp. 54, 55.

[2] Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 24. The proclamations are given in the Large Declaration, pp. 33, 34; also in Peterkin, p. 55.

[3] Letters and Journals, vol. i. p. 10.

their ears. When this was reported to the Privy Council, the Lord Treasurer and the Earl of Wigton, accompanied by their followers, courageously forced their way through the crowd to the town-house. They found the bailies in great perplexity, but after consultation it was resolved that Traquair and Wigton should return to the council-house, and that the magistrates should do what they could to disperse the crowd; and as the first step to this, they made it known that they had acceded to the requests of the people, and would join them in their petitions.

It was thought that this concession had so appeased the mob that the Lord Treasurer and his companions might now return in safety, but they no sooner appeared in the street than they were assailed by horrible cries. The magistrates came out, and told the people they had granted all that they asked, but to no purpose; the lords assured them that they would urge their request upon the king, but this was only mocked at; a rush was made, and the Lord Treasurer was thrown upon the ground, his hat, cloak, and white staff of office were pulled from him, and in all probability he would have been trodden to death had not some of his friends got him instantly to his feet, and then by the sway and pressure of the crowd he was half carried to the council-house door, where he and his friends immediately got entrance. They found Bishop Sydserf and the other councillors still in a state of siege, and trembling for the result. By and by the magistrates joined them, and declared that with all their efforts they had been unable to pacify the mob. There was nothing for it but to send for those nobles who had taken an active part against the Service-Book, and at their entreaties the crowd dispersed, and the councillors got home, most thankful that they had escaped with their lives.[1]

Next day a proclamation was made by the Privy Council, forbidding the citizens to assemble in the streets;[2] but the citizens cared little for a Council whom they had threatened and insulted with impunity on the preceding day. The town, however, was quiet, but the agitation went on, and a petition was presented to the Lord Chancellor, in name of the men, women, children, and servants of Edinburgh, and another to the Lords of Secret Council, by the noblemen, barons, ministers, burgesses, and commons of the kingdom, protesting

---

[1] Large Declaration, pp. 35-38. Guthrie, pp. 24, 25. Baillie, &c.

[2] Large Declaration, p. 38.

against the Service-Book, and demonstrating how wide-spread was the determination to resist his Majesty's meddling in ecclesiastical affairs.[1] It is clear from all this that the basis of opposition to the king's scheme of ecclesiastical uniformity had greatly widened. So long as the changes were merely from a presbyterian to an episcopal polity, the opposition was mainly clerical; they did not touch the people. But now when the changes were in the forms of worship, every one was interested, and assumed an attitude of dogged defiance. They would not worship according to the king's commandment. The storm had been slowly gathering since 1618; but the Articles of Perth had never been rigidly enforced, and the storm was stayed, but now when a Popish liturgy was to be forced upon a presbyterian people, it burst with the fury of a hurricane. We may see nothing very wrong in most of the Articles of Perth, or in most parts of the Laudian liturgy, but all the same we must applaud a people who resented these illegal interferences with its national religion.

The plans of the malcontents expanded with their power, as a man's avarice grows with his wealth. Their first thoughts were confined to the liturgy, but now they began to meditate the demolition of the Episcopate. Before separating, they resolved to meet again at Edinburgh on the 15th of November, bringing with them petitions and complaints against the bishops. On the appointed day the city began to fill with eager Reformers, from every part of the country. The confluence was greater than ever. The Earls of Rothes, Cassillis, Eglinton, Home, Lothian, and Wemyss, and the Lords Lindsay, Yester, Balmerino, Cranstone, and some others, had already declared themselves on the popular side; but now, mingling with the crowd for the first time, was seen the young Earl of Montrose,[2] who afterwards changed his side, and achieved for himself a chivalrous renown by leading the forlorn hope of the fallen throne.

The multitudes who thronged Edinburgh made the Council dread lest the outrages of the 18th of October should be renewed, and therefore they sent to the nobles who had come to town a remonstrance against their meetings, as illegal and disorderly. The nobles maintained their right to meet and petition, but declared the willingness of their party to act by

---

[1] It is not quite clear whether these petitions were presented on the 17th or 18th of October. Copies of them are given in the Large Declaration, pp. 41-4. See also Peterkin, p. 56.

[2] Guthrie's Memoirs, p. 27.

commissioners, and so prevent the possibility of disturbance from crowds of people being brought together.[1] The Council gave its sanction to the proposal, and thus unwittingly lent its aid to the establishment of a power in the State which very speedily superseded its own. Four permanent committees were accordingly appointed: the first consisted of all the nobles who had joined the cause; the second, of a gentleman for every county; the third, of a minister for every presbytery; and the fourth, of a burgher for every town. These committees sat at four different tables in the parliament-house, and were therefore called THE TABLES. Four representatives from each formed a central committee, which sat constantly in the capital, while the others only met upon grave emergencies.[2] These Tables were at first designed only to take charge of the petitions of the masses, and urge them upon the government; but they soon felt themselves so strong, from their representing and centralizing the feeling of the country, that they began not merely to form plans for the government of their party, but to issue mandates, which were universally respected and obeyed, while the proclamations of the king and his Council were treated with contempt. They soon assumed all the powers which were possessed by the clubs of Paris during the French Revolution. The government of the country virtually came into their hands.

Charles now began to open his eyes to the revolutionary spirit which his liturgy had evoked, but still he saw things very dimly, and appears to have had no idea that beneath a thin surface of respect, society was boiling like a volcano under his feet. He thought it enough to despatch the Earl of Roxburgh to negotiate, and, it was whispered, to bribe the leading malcontents; and afterwards to publish a proclamation, in which he declared to his faithful subjects, that it was only the tumultuous and barbarous insolences committed in Edinburgh, in contempt of his royal authority, which had hitherto prevented his royal resolution of considering their petitions, but that he was pleased out of his goodness to protest that he abhorred all superstition of Popery, and meant to do nothing contrary to the laudable laws of his native kingdom.[3] A

---

[1] Reference is made to this in the speech delivered by Lord Loudon before the Privy Council, on the 21st of December. See Balfour, vol. ii. p. 240.

[2] Stevenson's History, vol. i. p. 230.

[3] Proclamation made at Linlithgow, 7th December 1637. Large Declaration, p. 46.

proclamation like this, which meant nothing, was not the thing to pacify a people ripe for rebellion. If it was meant as a sedative, it rather served as an irritant. On the 21st of December, the Privy Council met at Dalkeith, and the deputies of the Tables appeared before it, and showed how rapidly their views were widening, by demanding that the bishops should be removed from their seats as parties in the case. They had been previously complained of, and accused as the authors of the liturgy, the causes of all the troubles which had afflicted the country; and on that ground a formal declinature of their judgment was now given in. The declinature was a bold one, and shows how high the pretensions of the party had risen, and what were the feelings which were abroad in the country; but it is very evident that, though an attempt was made to support it by a legal argument, no plea in law could deprive the bishops of their seats at the Council-board, on this simple ground, that the Council did not then sit as a court of justice. The bishops were not upon their trial before it.[1] The Council, having its hands tied by orders from court, remitted the whole matter for the determination of the king.

At the king's own request the Earl of Traquair, the Lord Treasurer, went up to London as the representative of the Scottish Council. His Majesty was profoundly ignorant of the precipice upon which he stood. To give up the liturgy, the Court of High Commission, the whole Episcopate, was not to be thought of. His prerogative must not be so abased. The Archbishop of St Andrews wrote him that if he condemned the present doings of the petitioners, and discharged all such procedure for the future under pain of treason, their combinations would melt like frost-work in the sun, or be driven like mist before the wind.[2] Laud and Strafford appear to have given similar advice.[3] The advice was taken, and Traquair returned to Scotland about the middle of February 1638 with his instructions.

The Council and Sessions were at this time held in Stirling, as Edinburgh was still in disgrace on account of the riots. After remaining some days in the metropolis, early on Monday

---

[1] Speeches of Lord Loudon and Mr James Cunningham before the Privy Council, 21st December 1637. See Balfour, Stevenson, and Peterkin. In the protest made against the royal proclamation on the 19th of February following, this declinature is referred to the 19th of December, but it is certain the speeches in defence of it were made on the 21st.

[2] Stevenson, vol. ii. p. 267.

[3] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. Harris's Life of Charles I.

morning, the 19th of February, the High Treasurer set out for the north. The Lords of the Tables, by fair means or foul, got a hint of his journey and its object, and within an hour afterwards Lords Lindsay and Home were in their saddles, riding to Stirling as fast as their horses could carry them. They outrode the Treasurer, and entered the town before him. At ten o'clock the heralds, with the royal arms on their back, accompanied by the Treasurer and Privy Seal, appeared at the market-cross, to read the proclamation. It extolled the "Book of Common Prayer" as the surest defence against superstition; it declared the petitioners to be deserving of high censure, but that they might hope for forgiveness, as their conduct had arisen from preposterous zeal rather than disloyalty; it discharged all future meetings under the highest pains; and commanded all save the inhabitants and Lords of the Council and Session, to leave the town without delay. When the heralds were done, and the flourish of trumpets was blown, Lords Lindsay and Home stepped forward, took instruments in the hands of a notary, and protested that they should still have a right to approach the king by petition; that they would not recognise the prelates as judges in any court, civil or ecclesiastical; that they should not incur any loss in life or lands for not observing such books, canons, rites, judicatories, and proclamations as were contrary to the Acts of Parliament and the Acts of the Assembly; that if any disturbance should arise, it should not be imputed to them; and, finally, that their requests proceeded from conscience, and had no other end but the preservation of the Reformed religion, and the laws and liberties of his Majesty's most ancient kingdom. The same scene occurred at Linlithgow, Edinburgh, and, in fact, wherever the proclamation was made. At the market-cross of Edinburgh, seventeen peers and a great concourse of ministers and citizens had assembled; the proclamation was read amid laughter and jeers; and the crowd compelled the pursuivants to remain and hear the protest.[1]

Men now began to feel that the crisis was come: they could not recede, it was not likely the king would; and therefore they began to forecast the future. A crash was almost inevitable. The only safety of the nation was in union, a union cemented not only by the love of liberty, but the sanctities of religion. Some of the leading men proposed that every adherent of the good cause should be bound together as one

---

[1] Large Declaration, pp. 47-52.

man by a solemn covenant. A covenant was no new thing in Scotland. The barons had been accustomed to league themselves together for mutual defence by subscribing "bands." Bands of man-rent had been known for centuries. When the Lords of the Congregation drew the sword for the Reformation, they joined themselves together in a covenant, which was frequently renewed. But it was the Confession and Covenant of 1581 which was now to be revived. At that period a Popish panic had taken hold of the country; it was said that the king's favourites were Papists; that the king himself was at least half a Papist; that Papist emissaries traversed the country; that a Papist army might soon be expected upon the coast; and to still this feeling James VI. had a confession prepared by Craig, the old colleague of Knox, in which all the chief errors of Romanism were solemnly abjured. It was signed by the king himself, by his household, by the members of the Privy Council, by men of all ranks throughout the country; and the country again breathed freer, and felt its liberties and religion were secure.

It was proposed in 1638 to league Presbyterian Scotland by such a solemn Confession and Covenant. The kingdom was prepared for it by a day of fasting, on which the pulpits gave forth no uncertain sound. The preparation of the document was entrusted to Alexander Henderson and Johnstone of Warriston. Lords Rothes, Loudon, and Balmerino were appointed to revise it. When ready, it was found to consist of three parts. The first was a faithful transcript of the Confession of 1581; the second was a summary of the acts of parliament condemning Popery, and ratifying the liberties of the Scottish Church, and was said to have been compiled by Warriston; the third was the true covenant, in which the subscribers swore, by the great name of the Lord their God, that they would continue in the profession of their religion; that they would defend it against all errors and corruptions; that they would stand by his Majesty in support of the religion, liberties, and laws of the kingdom, and also by one another against all their enemies; and this was said to have been written by Henderson.[1]

When the first draft of the Covenant was submitted to the committees, there was not unanimity. Some objected that they could not pronounce the Articles of Perth to be unlaw-

---

[1] This Confession and Covenant is now generally bound in the same volume with the Westminster Confession, where every reader may see it.

ful; others that they could not get rid of their ordination vows without perjury; others that they could not league themselves together for mutual defence without treason. But, after long discussion, alterations were made in some cases, scruples of conscience were silenced in others, and harmony was all but restored. Everything was now ready for the subscriptions of the people, and it was determined that Edinburgh should be first tried.[1]

On the 28th day of February an immense concourse of people had gathered in the Greyfriars Church, and thousands who could not get access to the church crowded the church-yard. The peaceful abodes of the dead, where there was no passion, nor knowledge, nor device, contrasted strangely with the excited feelings of the living who trod upon them; and the fine old conventual building grimly lifted up its hoary walls and mullioned windows above the surging heads of the Presbyterian multitude, with its reminiscences of Roman worship and monastic ties. Thus death and life, the old and the new, meet and harmonise. About two o'clock, Loudon and Rothes of the nobility, Henderson and Dickson of the ministers, and Johnstone, their legal adviser, arrived with the Covenant, ready for signature. Henderson opened the proceedings by prayer; Loudon next stood up and addressed the meeting; and then all were invited to come forward and sign. The aged Earl of Sutherland was the first to append his name. He was followed by Sir Andrew Murray, the minister of Abdy, in Fife. Then high-born and low-born together crowded forward to add their signatures. When all in the church had signed the solemn document, it was taken out to the church-yard and laid upon a flat gravestone. The enthusiasm of the crowd rose to its greatest height. Men and women were alike ambitious to subscribe their names. Some wrote after their signatures, "till death;" others could not restrain their feelings, and wept. This went on for hours, till every part of the parchment was covered, and the subscribers had only room to write their initials; and dark night alone put an end to the scene.[2] Henderson afterwards described it as "the day of the Lord's power, wherein they had seen His people most willingly offer themselves in multitudes, like the dew of the morning."[3] "It may well be said of this day," says another old writer, "Great

---

[1] See Baillie's Letters and Journals.

[2] This copy of the Covenant, with the signatures attached, is still preserved.

[3] First Answer to the Reply of the Aberdeen Doctors.

was the day of Jezreel. It was a day wherein the arm of the Lord was revealed—a day wherein the princes of the people were assembled to swear fealty and allegiance to that great King whose name is the Lord of Hosts."[1]

Copies of the Covenant were next day carried through the city, and signed by almost every one who was solicited. Other copies were sent down to the presbyteries for subscription; the contagious enthusiasm of the capital spread over the whole country; and almost everywhere the people, by appended names and uplifted hands, took the Covenant oath. "I was present," says Livingstone, "at Lanark, and at several other parishes, when on a Sabbath, after the forenoon's sermon, the Covenant was read and sworn, and may truly say, that in all my lifetime, except one day at the Kirk of Shotts, I never saw such motions from the Spirit of God, all the people generally and most willingly concurring. I have seen more than a thousand persons all at once lifting up their hands, and the tears falling down from their eyes; so that through the whole land, except the professed Papists, and some few who for base ends adhered to the prelates, the people universally entered into the Covenant with God."[2] The whole Scotch population seems to have been melted into one mass by the burning religious zeal that was abroad, as they were knit into one brotherhood by their Covenant with God. It is difficult, in times of perfect quietude, to understand the high excitement of such a period. It can only be compared to the outburst of feeling which accompanied the first preaching of Christianity, the first preaching of the Reformation, or those religious revivals which have sometimes broken out in a particular district, and sometimes mysteriously swept over a whole country.

Yet there was not perfect unanimity in the nation. Some of the Glasgow ministers and professors, and among them the famous Zachary Boyd, refused to take the Covenant. The town of St Andrews, under the influence of the Archbishop, kept back from joining in the general movement. The doctors of the Universities of Aberdeen both spoke and wrote against it; and few in the city could be induced to subscribe, notwithstanding the persuasions of a deputation, who hurried to the north to reduce their obstinacy. They

---

[1] Wilson's Defence of the Reformation Principles of the Church of Scotland, quoted by Stevenson, vol. ii. p. 298.

[2] Life. p. 22, quoted by Stevenson, vol. ii. p. 296.

declared it was an unlawful combination against lawful authority. Pamphlets were published upon both sides of the question; and the controversy was maintained with equal acrimony and equal ability.[1] But this jarring note was scarcely heard amid the full concord of voices which came from every part of the empire; and the Archbishop of St Andrews is reported, when he heard of the scene in the Greyfriars church-yard, to have said—"They have thrown down in a day what we have been building up for thirty years."

The National Covenant has been a bone of contention among Scottish historians. Some have lauded it as the offspring of piety and patriotism; others have denounced it as the offspring of fanaticism and rebellion. Some have spoken of it as an imperishable monument (the admiration of the world) of the religious feelings of our ancestors; others have told how it scandalized the Churches of the Reformation on the Continent.[2] It is certain that the Lord Advocate of the time declared that there was nothing illegal in it—nothing inconsistent with proper loyalty to a constitutional sovereign, and eminent lawyers of modern days have held the same; and yet, if we interpret it as the Covenanters themselves did, when they afterwards took up arms against their king for their mutual defence, it is difficult to understand how law should sanction such a league. But to quote law in such cases is mere pedantry. There are times when law must be set aside—when man resumes his natural rights. The king had violated the laws of the land: why should not the people? The king had attempted, in defiance of the constitution, to force an obnoxious liturgy upon the nation: why should not the nation band itself together and defy him to do it? Is the monarch made for the nation, or the nation for the monarch? Is the will of the one or the will of the many to be supreme? Should the people, for fear of violating some statute, and giving pain to some men in high places, sit still and allow their

---

[1] The Answers of some Brethren of the Ministrie to the Replyes of the Ministers and Professors of Divinitie in Aberdene, concerning the late Covenant. Printed in the year of God 1638, &c.

[2] The king, in his Large Declaration, affirms this: and Baillie, in one of his letters, complains that the Continental Churches had not sympathised with them in their struggles.

religion and liberties to be trampled on? Had the Covenant not been subscribed, it is certain the liturgy would have been introduced, the canons enforced, and the heel of arbitrary power placed on the neck of the country. This is its justification.

END OF VOL. I.

Turnbull & Spears, Printers.

D
243
.2

THE HECKMAN BINDERY INC
BOUND TO PLEASE
JULY 75
N. MANCHESTER